



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

28/8

सं० 34]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, अगस्त 25, 1984/भाद्र 3, 1906

No. 34]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, AUGUST 25, 1984/BHADRA 3, 1906

इस भाग में अलग पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (II)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों द्वारा जारी किये गये सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence)

योजना आयोग

गृह मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 30 जुलाई, 1984

नई दिल्ली, 4 अगस्त, 1984

का० आ० 2687.—योजना आयोग की दिनांक 6 फरवरी, 1984 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के क्रम में भारत में निगमित कराधान पर डा. आई. एस. गुलाटी की अध्यक्षता में गठित अध्ययन दल की अवधि 30 सितम्बर, 1984 तक और बढ़ाई जाती है।

का०आ० 2688—केन्द्रीय सरकार, आतंकवादी क्षेत्र (विशेष न्यायालय) अध्यादेश, 1984 (1984 का 9) की धारा 9 की अपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इससे संलग्न अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट व्यक्तियों को उनके नामों के सामने उक्त अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (3) में, तत्संबंधी प्रविष्टि में विनिर्दिष्ट विशेष न्यायालयों में मामलों को चलाने के लिये लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या ए. 12034/7/83-प्रशासन-I]

के. सी. अग्रवाल, निदेशक (प्रशासन)

अनुसूची

PLANNING COMMISSION

New Delhi, the 30th July, 1984

S.O. 2687.—In continuation of Planning Commission's Notification of even number dated 6th February, 1984, the term of the Study Group on Corporate Taxation in India, constituted under the Chairmanship of Dr. I. S. Gulati, is further extended upto 30th September, 1984.

[No. A-12034/7/83-Admn. I]

K. C. AGARWAL, Director (Admn.)

638 GI/84—1

क्र०सं०	व्यक्तियों का नाम	विशेष न्यायालय का नाम
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	श्री आर० के० आनन्द, जिला अटर्नी, फिरोजपुर।	विशेष न्यायालय, फिरोजपुर।
2.	श्री विनोद गुप्ता, जिला अटर्नी, लुधियाना।	विशेष न्यायालय, जलंधर।
3.	श्री सुरिन्दर सिंह, जिला अटर्नी, पटियाला।	विशेष न्यायालय, पटियाला।

[सं० 3/1/84-विधिक सैल]

श्री बल्लभ शरण, संयुक्त सचिव

(2479)

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 4th August, 1984

S. O. 2638.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Terrorist Affected Areas (Special Courts) Ordinance, 1984 (9 of 1984), the Central Government hereby appoints the persons specified in column (2) of the Schedule annexed hereto to be Public Prosecutors for conducting cases in the Special Courts specified against their names in the corresponding entry in column (3) thereof.

SCHEDULE

Serial No.	Name of the person	Name of the Special Court
(1)	(2)	(3)
1.	Shri R.K. Anand, District Attorney, Ferozepur.	Special Court Ferozepur.
2.	Shri Vinod Gupta, District Attorney, Ludhiana.	Special Court Jalandhar.
3.	Shri Surinder Singh, District Attorney, Patiala.	Special Court Patiala.

[No. 3/1/84-Leg. Cell]
S.V. SHARAN, Jt. Secy.

(कार्मिक और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 4 अगस्त, 1984

कांआं 2689—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का 25) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निम्नलिखित अपराधों को ऐसे अपराधों के रूप में विनिर्दिष्ट करती है जिनका अन्वेषण दिल्ली पुलिस स्थापन द्वारा किया जायेगा, अर्थात्—

- (क) भारतीय दंड संहिता, 1860 (1860 का 45) की धारा 346 के अधीन दंडनीय अपराध, और
- (ख) खण्ड (क) में उल्लिखित अपराधों के संबंध में या उनसे संबंधित प्रयत्नों, दुष्प्रणों और षड्यंत्रों के तथा वैसे ही व्यवहार के अनुक्रम में किया गया कोई अन्य अपराध जो उन्हीं तथ्यों से उत्पन्न हुआ हो।

[संख्या 228/9/84-ए.वी.डी.-II]

एच०के० वर्मा, अवसर सचिव

(Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms)

New Delhi, the 4th August, 1984

S.O. 2689.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (25 of 1946), the Central Government hereby specifies the following offences as the offences which are to be investigated by the Delhi Special Police Establishment, namely:—

- (a) Offences punishable under section 346 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (45 of 1860); and
- (b) attempts, abetments and conspiracies in relation to, or in connection with, the offences mentioned in clause (a) and any other offence committed in the course of the same transaction arising out of the same facts.

[No. 228/9/84-AVD. II]

H. K. VERMA, Under Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 2 अगस्त, 1984

स्टाम्प

कांआं 2690.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा स्टैण्डर्ड मिल्स कम्पनी लिमिटेड, बम्बई को मात्र एक लाख, बारह हजार, पांच सौ रुपये के उस समेकित स्टाम्प शुल्क की अदायगी करने की अनुमति देती है जो उक्त कम्पनी द्वारा जारी किये जाने वाले एक करोड़ पचास लाख रुपये अंकित मूल्य के ऋण पत्रों के रूप में बन्धपत्रों पर स्टाम्प शुल्क के कारण प्रभाय है।

[सं० 48/84-स्टाम्प-फा० सं० 33/44/84-वि०क०]

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 2nd August, 1984

STAMPS

S.O. 2690.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby permits the Standard Mills Company Limited Bombay to pay consolidated stamp duty of rupees One lakh twelve thousand five hundred only chargeable on account of the stamp duty on bonds in the form of debentures of the face value of rupees one crore and fifty lakhs to be issued by the said Company.

[No. 48/84-Stamp/F. No. 33/44/84-ST]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 6 अगस्त, 1984

स्टाम्प

कांआं 2691.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उस शुल्क को माफ करती है जो तमिऴनाडू विद्युत बोर्ड द्वारा मात्र तीन करोड़ नवासी लाख, चौबीस हजार, सात सौ रुपये मूल्य के वचन पत्रों के रूप में जारी किए जाने वाले "8-75 प्रतिगण विद्युत बोर्ड ऋण 2001" के सम्बन्ध में बन्ध पत्रों पर उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत प्रभाय है।

[सं० 49/84-स्टाम्प फा सं० 33/40/84-वि. क.]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 6th August, 1984

STAMPS

S.O. 2691.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby remits the duty with which the bonds in the nature of Promissory notes of the value of rupees three crores

eighty nine lakhs twenty four thousand seven hundred only to be issued in connection with "8.75 per cent Tamil Nadu Electricity Board Loan 2001" by the Tamil Nadu Electricity Board are chargeable under the said Act.

[No. 49/84-Stamp-F. No. 33/40/84-ST]

आदेश

स्टाम्प

का०आ० 2692.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा महाराष्ट्र स्टेट वित्तीय निगम बम्बई को मात्र तीन लाख, इकहत्तर हजार और दो सौ पचास रुपये के उस समेकित स्टाम्प शुल्क की अदायगी करने की अनुमति देती है जो उक्त निगम द्वारा किए जाने वाले चार करोड़ पचास लाख रुपये अंकित मूल्य के ऋण पत्रों के रूप में बन्धपत्रों पर स्टाम्प शुल्क के कारण प्रभाव्य है।

[सं. 50/84-स्टाम्प-फा. सं. 33/13/84-वि. क.]

ORDER

STAMPS

S.O. 2692.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby permits the Maharashtra State Financial Corporation Bombay to pay consolidated stamp duty of rupee three lakhs seventy one thousand and two hundred and fifty only, chargeable on account of the stamp duty on bonds in the form of debentures of the face value of rupees four crores and ninetyfive lakhs to be issued by the said Corporation.

[No. 50/84-Stamp F. No. 33/13/84-ST]

आदेश

स्टाम्प

का०आ० 2693.—भारतीय स्टाम्प अधिनियम, 1899 (1899 का 2) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा टाटा आयरन और स्टील कम्पनी लिमिटेड बम्बई को मात्र सैतीस लाख, पचास हजार रुपये के उस समेकित स्टाम्प शुल्क की अदायगी करने की अनुमति देती है जो उक्त कम्पनी द्वारा जारी किए जाने वाले 50 करोड़ रुपये अंकित मूल्य के ऋण पत्रों के रूप में बन्धपत्रों पर स्टाम्प शुल्क के कारण प्रभाव्य है।

[सं. 51/84-स्टाम्प-फा. सं. 33/46/84-वि. क.]

भगवान दास, अवर सचिव

ORDER

STAMPS

S.O. 2693.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899) the Central Government hereby permits the Tata Iron and Steel Company Ltd Bombay to pay consolidated stamp duty of rupees thirty seven lakhs and fifty thousand only, chargeable on account of the stamp duty on bonds in the form of debentures of the face value of rupees fifty crores to be issued by the said company.

[No. 51/84-Stamp-F. No. 33/46/84-ST]

BHAGWAN DAS, Under Secy.

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 28 जुलाई, 1984

का०आ० 2694.—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री एस० के० सक्सेना को इलाहाबाद क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक, इलाहाबाद का अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है तथा 8-6-1984 से प्रारम्भ होकर 30-6-1987 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि को उस अवधि के रूप में निर्धारित करती है जिसके दौरान श्री एस० के० सक्सेना अध्यक्ष के रूप में कार्य करेंगे।

[संख्या एफ० 2/149/82-आर० आर० बी०]

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 28th July, 1984

S.O. 2694.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976) the Central Government hereby appoints Shri S. K. Saksena as the Chairman of the Allahabad Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Allahabad (U.P.) and specifies the period commencing on the 8-6-1984 and ending with the 30-6-1987 as the period for which the said Shri S. K. Saksena shall hold office as such Chairman.

[No. F. 2(149)/82-RRBI]

का०आ० 2695.—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री आर०ए० गोयन्का को प्रतापगढ़ क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक, प्रतापगढ़ का अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है तथा 19-5-1984 से प्रारम्भ होकर 31-5-1987 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि को उस अवधि के रूप में निर्धारित करती है जिसके दौरान श्री आर०ए० गोयन्का अध्यक्ष के रूप में कार्य करेंगे।

[सं० एफ० 2-149/82-आर० आर० बी०]

S.O. 2695.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976) the Central Government hereby appoints Shri R. A. Goenka, as the Chairman of the Pratapgarh Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Pratapgarh and specifies the period commencing on the 19-5-1984 and ending with the 31-5-1987 as the period for which the said Shri R. A. Goenka shall hold office as such Chairman.

[No. F. 2-149/82-RRB]

का०आ० 2696.—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री एस० सी० मेहता को माबुआ अधार क्षेत्रीय ग्रामीण बैंक माबुआ का अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है तथा 1-7-1984 से प्रारम्भ होकर 30-6-1985 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के रूप में निर्धारित करती है जिसके दौरान श्री एस० सी० मेहता अध्यक्ष के रूप में कार्य करेंगे।

[सं० एफ० 2-71/82-आर० आर० बी०]

S.O. 2696.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri S. C. Mehta as the Chairman of the Jhabua-Dhar Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Jhabua and specifies the period commencing on the 1-7-1984 and ending with the 30-6-1985 as the period for which the said Shri S. C. Mehta shall hold office as such Chairman.

[No. F. 2-71/82-RRB]

का० आ० 2697.—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री के० एम० नंबियार को नार्थ मालाबार ग्रामीण बैंक, कन्नानोर (केरल) का अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है तथा 28-6-1984 से प्रारम्भ होकर 30-6-1987 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि को उस अवधि के रूप में निर्धारित करती है जिसके दौरान श्री के० एम० नंबियार अध्यक्ष के रूप में कार्य करेंगे।

[सं० एफ० 8-35/78-आर० आर० बी०]

एस० एस० हसूरकर, निदेशक

S.O. 2697.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976) the Central Government hereby appoints Shri K. M. Nambiar as the Chairman of the North Malabar Gramin Bank, Cannanore (Kerala) and specifies the period commencing on the 28th June, 1984 and ending with the 30-6-1987 as the period for which the said Shri K. M. Nambiar shall hold office as such Chairman.

[No. F. 8-35/78-RRB]

S. S. HASURKAR, Director

नई दिल्ली, 1 अगस्त, 1984

का०आ० 2698.—बैंकारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर एतद्वारा घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम, की धारा 19 की उपधारा (2) के उपबन्ध 8 जून, 1986 तक की और अवधि तक यूनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया, कलकत्ता पर उस सीमा तक लागू नहीं होंगे जहां तक कि इनका संबंध मैसर्स लुज इलेक्ट्रिकल्स प्रा० लि० के शेयरों की इसकी धारिता से है।

[संख्या 15/23/84-बी०ओ०-III]

New Delhi, the 1st August, 1984

S.O. 2698.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of sub-section (2) of section 19 of the said Act shall not apply to the United Bank of India, Calcutta for a further period till 8th June, 1986 insofar as they relate to its holding of the shares in M/s. Luz Electrical Pvt. Ltd.

[No. 15/23/84-B.O. III]

का०आ० 2699.—बैंकारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर एतद्वारा घोषणा करती है कि उक्त

अधिनियम की धारा 19(2) के उपबन्ध 12 फरवरी, 1986 तक यूनियन बैंक ऑफ इंडिया पर उस सीमा तक लागू नहीं होंगे जहां तक इनका संबंध बनारस स्टेट बैंक लिमिटेड, वाराणसी के शेयरों में इसकी धारिता से है।

[संख्या 15/21/84-बी०ओ०-III]

S.O. 2699.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of section 19(2) of the said Act shall not apply till 12th February, 1986 to the Union Bank of India in so far as they relate to its holding in shares of Benaras State Bank Ltd., Varanasi.

[No. 15/21/84-B.O. III]

नई दिल्ली, 14 अगस्त, 1984

का०आ० 2700.—बैंकारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ड) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा "इक्विपमेंट लीजिंग" को ऐसे कारबार के रूप में निर्दिष्ट करती है, जिसे किसी बैंकिंग कम्पनी द्वारा किया जाना विधिपूर्ण है।

[संख्या 15/10/84-बी० ओ०-III]

माधव वैद्य, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 14th August, 1984

S.O. 2700.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (o) of sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government hereby specifies "equipment leasing" as a form of business in which it is lawful for a banking company to engage.

[No. 15/10/84-B.O. III]

M. R. VAIDYA, Under Secy.

आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण

बम्बई, 27 जुलाई, 1984

का०आ० 2701.—अनुपूरक नियम (स्प्लीमेंटरी रूल) 1960 में प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, दिनांक 15 फरवरी, 1976 की अधिसूचना क्रमांक 6-एडी/एटी/73 की अधिसूची यथा संशोधित अधिसूचना क्रमांक एफ० 215-एडी/(एटी)/72 दिनांक 4 सितम्बर, 1980 और 1 अप्रैल, 1982 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन किए जाते हैं।

(1) कालम (1) के शब्द, "उपाध्यक्ष, आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण, उत्तरक्षेत्र, नई दिल्ली" के स्थान में निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित कीजिए, "वरिष्ठ उपाध्यक्ष, आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण, उत्तरक्षेत्र, नई दिल्ली"

(2) कालम (3) में दर्शाये शब्द 'मध्यप्रदेश के रीवा, जबलपुर, विलासपुर और ग्वालियर, संभाग और भोपाल संभाग के बलूल और होशंगाबाद जिले' के स्थान में निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित कीजिए,

“मध्यप्रदेश, रायपुर संभाग को छोड़कर”

- (3) उपाध्यक्ष, आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण पश्चिम क्षेत्र बम्बई के सामने, कालम (3) में दर्शाए शब्द “मध्य प्रदेश के रायपुर संभाग, इंदौर में भाग और भोपाल संभाग के होशंगाबाद और बेतूल जिले को छोड़कर” के स्थान में निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित कीजिए

“मध्यप्रदेश का रायपुर संभाग”

उपरोक्त संशोधन दिनांक 1 अगस्त, 1984 से लागू होंगे।

[क्रमांक एफ. 215-एडी (एटी)/72]

INCOME-TAX APPELLATE TRIBUNAL

Bombay, the 27th July, 1984

S.O. 2701.—In exercise of the powers conferred on me by the Supplementary Rule 60, the following amendments are ordered in the Schedule below Notification No. VI-Ad (AT)/73 dated 15th February, 1974 as amended by Notifications No. F. 215-Ad (AT)/72 dated 4th September, 1980 and 1st April, 1982 :

- (1) For the words “Vice President Income-tax Appellate Tribunal, Northern Zone, New Delhi” under Col. (1) the following may be substituted :

“Senior Vice President, Income-tax Appellate Tribunal Northern Zone, New Delhi”

- (2) For the words “Rewa, Jabalpur, Bilaspur and Gwalior Divisions and Districts of Hoshangabad and Betul of Bhopal Division of Madhya Pradesh” shown as Sl. No. (3) against the above, the following may be substituted :

“Madhya Pradesh excluding Raipur Division”

- (3) Against Vice President, Income-tax Appellate Tribunal, Western Zone, Bombay :

For the words “Raipur Division, Indore Division and Bhopal Division excluding Districts of Hoshangabad and Betul of Madhya Pradesh” shown as Sl. No. (3).

the following may be substituted :

“Raipur Division of Madhya Pradesh”

The above amendments will come into effect from the 1st August, 1984.

[No. F. 215-Ad (AT)/72]

का.आ. 2702.—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 252 की उपधारा (5) यथा संशोधित वित्त अधिनियम 1972 (1972 का 16) में प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए दिनांक 4 फरवरी 1974 की अधिसूचना क्रमांक 6-एडी/एटी/22 यथा संशोधित अधिसूचना क्रमांक एफ-215 (2) एडी/एटी/72 दिनांक 4 सितम्बर, 1980 और 1 अप्रैल 1982 की अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित संशोधन किए जाते हैं :

- (1) पश्चिम क्षेत्र, बम्बई की कालम 2 की अनुसूची में से शब्द “इन्दौर पीठ” निकाल दीजिए, और

- (2) उत्तर क्षेत्र, नई दिल्ली की कालम 2 की अनुसूची में शब्द “इन्दौर पीठ” जोड़ दीजिए।

2. उपरोक्त संशोधन 1 अगस्त 1984 से लागू होंगे।

[सं० एफ/215 (2) एडी/एटी/72]

टी. डी. सुगला, अध्यक्ष,

आयकर अपीलीय अधिकरण

S.O. 2702.—In exercise of the powers conferred on me by Sub-section (5) of Section 252 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) as amended by the Finance Act, 1972 (16 of 1972), the following amendments are ordered in the Schedule below Notification No. VI-Ad (AT)/72 dated 4th February, 1974 as amended by Notifications No. F. 215 (2)-Ad (AT)/72 dated 4th September, 1980 and 1st April, 1982 :

- (1) Delete the words “Indore Bench” under Col. (2) of the Schedule against Western Zone, Bombay, and

- (2) Add the words “Indore Bench” against Northern Zone, New Delhi under Col. (2) of the Schedule.

2. The above amendments will come into effect from the 1st August, 1984.

[No. F. 215(2)-Ad (AT)/72]

T. D. SUGLA, President,
Income-tax Appellate Tribunal.

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क समाहर्ता का कार्यालय

कलकत्ता, 1 जुलाई, 1984

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क

अधिसूचना सं०/केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क

का.आ. 2703 —केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क नियमावली,

1944 के नियम 5 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं श्री नरेन्द्र कुमार वाजपेयी, समाहर्ता, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क कलकत्ता-1, इसके द्वारा संलग्न विवरण के कालम 3 में उल्लिखित अधिकारियों को अपने सम्बन्धित कार्यक्षेत्र में उक्त विवरण के 1 कालम के विविध नियमों के अन्तर्गत उल्लिखित समाहर्ता की शक्तियों और कालम 2 में व्यक्त शक्तियों के प्रकार को कालम 4 में दी गई शर्तों तथा सीमाओं के अनुसार प्रयोग करने को प्राधिकृत करता हूँ।

2. अब तक के केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क समाहर्ता, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, कलकत्ता समाहर्तालय द्वारा केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क नियमावली, 1944 के विविध नियमों के अधीन, नियम, 5 को छोड़कर, लेखाओं के रख-रखाव तथा कच्चे माल आदि के निर्धारण के सम्बन्ध में जारी की गई अधिसूचनाएं जो अभी कायम हैं वे केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क कलकत्ता-1 समाहर्तालय में तब तक कारगर रहेंगी जब तक कि कोई एक या उनका अंश विशेष रूप से रद्द या हटा नहीं दिया जाता।

[फा. सं. 4 (8) के.उ./84]

नरेन्द्र कुमार वाजपेयी, समाहर्ता

OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR OF CENTRAL EXCISE

Calcutta, the 1st July, 1984

CENTRAL EXCISE

Notification No. 1/Central Excise/1984

S.O. 2703.—In exercise of the powers conferred on me by Rule 5 of the Central Excise Rules 1944, I, Sri N. K. Bajpai, Collector of Central Excise, Calcutta-I do hereby authorise the officers shown in column 3 of the annexed statement to exercise within their respective jurisdiction the

powers of the Collector under the various Rules enumerated in column 1 and the nature of power specified in column 2 of the said statement subject to the limitations and conditions set out in column 4 thereof.

2. The notifications issued by the Collector of Central Excise of the erstwhile Calcutta Collectorate of Central Excise under various Rules other than Rule 5 of the Central

Excise Rules 1944, regarding maintenance of accounts prescription of raw materials etc. which are still subsisting will continue to be in force in Calcutta I Collectorate of Central Excise under any one or part of them is specifically rescinded or superseded.

[F. No. IV(8)1-CE/84]

N. K. BAJPAI, Collector.

Statement showing delegation of Collector's powers under Central Excise Rules, 1944.

Central Excise Rules.	Nature of power delegated.	Officers to whom delegated.	Limitations & Conditions
1	2	3	4
3.	Approval of authorised person/agent.	Superintendent.	
9(1)	(i) Specifying places where excisable goods are produced, cured or manufactured and premises appurtenant thereto.	Licensing authority.	
9(1A)	(ii) Permission to open account current Permission to withdraw amount from account current.	Superintendent. Superintendent.	Subject to the procedure prescribed by the Collector.
9B(3)	Permission to enter into General Bond and fulfilment of such conditions as may be required and to demand a fresh Bond or additional security.	Assistant Collector.	
12.	(i) Power to condone delay in Export. (ii) Power of Collector under Rule. 12.	Assistant Collector. Assistant Collector.	
12A(3) 12A(6)& 12A(7)	Satisfaction of Collector. Power of Collector for evidence/information Books of Accounts etc.	[Officers competent to grant rebate.	
13.	Acceptance of individual bond 5 B.I (security/ surety) and acceptance of proof of export in respect of such bond.	Superintendent.	
14.	Permission to enter into a General Bond and fulfilment of such conditions as may be required and demand a fresh bond or additional security.	Assistant Collector.	
14A.	(i) All powers except power to refuse permission to make further export.	Officer accepting B-1 Bond.	
14A.	(ii) Power to refuse permission to make further export.	Deputy Collector	
14B(1)	(iii) Power under proviso (c) (i) Over-drawal upto 50% of the bond amount. (ii) Over-drawal upto 75% of the bond amount	Officers accepting the bond. Assistant Collector. Deputy Collector.	
14B(2)	Power to refuse further export.	Deputy Collector.	
18(3)	Power to forfeit security	Assistant Collector.	
19(2)	(i) Power regarding remission of duty amounting to: (a) not exceeding Rs. 1000/- (b) Exceeding Rs. 1000/-, but not exceeding Rs. 2500/- (c) Exceeding Rs. 2500/- but not exceeding Rs. 5000/- (ii) Powers of officers for exercising supervision over destruction	Superintendent. Superintendent. Assistant Collector. Deputy Collector. Inspector. Superintendent, Assistant Collector.	upto Rs. 1000/- upto Rs. 2500/- above Rs. 2500/-
27(1)	Powers regarding licensing, bond and other conditions.	Licensing authority.	
27(4)	(i) Power regarding remission of duty amounting to: (a) Not exceeding Rs. 1000/- (b) Exceeding Rs. 1000/- but not exceeding Rs. 2,500/- (c) Exceeding Rs. 2,500/-, but not exceeding Rs. 5000/- (ii) Powers of officer for exercising supervision over destruction.	Superintendent. Superintendent Superintendent. Assistant Collector. Deputy Collector. Inspector. Superintendent, Assistant Collector. Deputy Collector.	
30.	Preliminary weighment	Deputy Collector.	
38.	Securing accommodation for unmanufactured products after covering and packing.	Licensing authority.	
43.	Receipt of notice.	Licensing authority.	
44.	Power to require declaration	Licensing authority.	
46.	Power to require marking	Licensing authority.	

1	2	3	4
47(1) & (3) 48. 49(1)	Exemption from providing/approval of store room. Bond and security. (i) Powers regarding remission of duty amounting to (a) not exceeding Rs. 1000/- (b) Exceeding Rs. 1000/- but not exceeding Rs. 2,500/- (c) Exceeding Rs. 2,500/- but not exceeding Rs. 5000/- (ii) Powers of officer for excising supervision over destruction.	Licensing Authority. Licensing authority. Superintendent. Assistant Collector. Deputy Collector. Inspector. Superintendent. Assistant Collector. Superintendent.	 upto Rs. 1000/- upto Rs. 2,500/- above Rs. 2,500/-
50. 50A.	Permission to remove non-excisable goods. (i) Types of case covered under the following circumstances. (a) goods received/retained for use in the manufacture of other goods in the factory or (b) goods returned to the factory for being remade, refined, reconditioned, repaired or, subjected to any other similar process in the factory, or (c) When after payment of duty the goods cannot be transported due to circumstances beyond the assessee's control such as suspension of booking on Railways, non-availability of Railway wagon or brake-down of carriers ; or 51A. (d) goods required for test or for studying design or method of construction; or (e) goods required to be stored in the factory premises for retail sales or for issue as complementary gifts or for, repacking, into packages so as to suit the requirements of individual customers; or (f) goods required in the factory for construction or repairs and or for any other purpose for which such goods are normally consumed. (ii) other types of cases	Superintendent. Assistant Collector. Assistant Collector.	 Subject to the procedure prescribed by the Collector.
52. 52A.	Reduction in time limit for putting in application for removal. Acceptance of assessee's documents in lieu of gate pass in prescribed form.	Assistant Collector. Assistant Collector.	
53.	Permission to manufacturer not to make entries in R.G. 1 on dates when there is not transaction.	Superintendent.	
54. 56A.	Power to require return for other products. (i) Power to permit a manufacturer to avail of the procedure. (ii) Withdrawal of permission. (iii) Powers in respect of sub-rule (2A), (2B), (2C), Proviso to sub-rule (3) (ii), (3) (vii) (d), (6) and (7) of Rule 56A.	Deputy Collector. Assistant Collector. Deputy Collector. Assistant Collector.	
56AA. 56B. 56C.	All Powers of Collector Grant of Permission. (i) All powers of the Collector under the Sub-rule(1), (ii) Powers of the Collector under the second proviso, third proviso and fourth proviso to sub-rule(1).	Assistant Collector Assistant Collector Assistant Collector Assistant Collector	
65(3) 65(4) 71(3) 75. 85.	Trust receipt and bond etc. Fixing number of Central Excise Stamps Approval of labels. Prescribing hours for transaction Officer to be empowered by the Collector.	Assistant Collector Assistant Collector Superintendent. Assistant Collector Chief Chemist In charge Central Revenue Control Laboratory of the respective area.	
92A(1)	Power to accept first ASP	Superintendent. Assistant Collector.	For the Prescribed period for a period less than the Prescribed period
92A(3) 92A(4)	To condone or determine the period of preclusion etc. (i) Acceptance of renewal application.	Assistant Collector. Superintendent	

1	2	3	4
	(ii) To condone or determine the period of preclusion etc.	Superintendent. Assistant Collector. Assistant Collector.	Upto 15 days. Beyond 15 days.
92B.	Exclusion of the period of closure for purposes of computing duty liability.		
92B(3)	Accepting notice for shorter period.	Superintendent.	
92C(2)	To condone delay in weekly deposits/submission of application.	Superintendent.	Upto 2 days in respect of weekly deposits/ application. Upto 5 days in respect of monthly deposits/ application.
		Assistant Collector.	Beyond the period mentioned above.
92E(iii)	To debar availing of special procedure.	Deputy Collector.	
92F	To condone failure to apply for special procedure.	Deputy Collector.	
93(b) (iii)	Approval of wrapper, outer covering or labels.	Superintendent.	Approved specimen to sent to Assistant Collector & Collector.
95A	Powers of Collector.	Assistant Collector.	---
96D	Permission for general bonds and demands for fresh bond/additional security.	Assistant Collector.	In case of removal within the division.
96DD		Deputy Collector.	In case of removal outside the division/Collectorate
96E		Superintendent.	Acceptance of bond in all cases.
96EE			
96I(1)	To accept A.S.P.	Superintendent.	
96I(2)	To accept A.S.P. for shorter period.	Assistant Collector.	
96I(3)	To determine period of preclusion.	Assistant Collector.	
96I(4)	(i) to accept renewal application in form A.S.P. (ii) to condone and/or determine the period of preclusion.	Superintendent. Superintendent.	For condoning delay ex- ceeding 15 days.
		Assistant Collector.	For condoning delay ex- ceeding 15 days.
96K(2)	To condone delay in making the application.	Superintendent.	Upto 2 days in case of quarterly application and 10 days in case of annual application.
			Beyond the above limits.
96-MMMM	To condone failure to apply for special procedure.	Assistant Collector.	
96-O(1)	To accept A.S.P.	Deputy Collector.	
96-O(2)	To accept A.S.P. for shorter period.	Superintendent	
96-O(3)	To determine period of preclusion.	Assistant Collector.	
96-O(4)	(i) to accept renewal application in form A.S.P. (ii) to condone and/or determine the period of preclusion.	Superintendent. Superintendent.	For condoning delay not exceeding 15 days.
		Assistant Collector.	For condoning delay ex- ceeding 15 days.
96-Q(1) Proviso	To Permit separate weekly application	Assistant Collector.	
96-Q(2)	To condone delay in making application/deposit.	Superintendent.	Upto one day in case of weekly application/depo- sit and two days in case of monthly/quarterly Application/Deposit.
			Beyond the above limit.
96-U	To condone failure to apply for special procedure.	Assistant Collector.	
96ZE(4)	To accept A.S.P.	Deputy Collector.	
96ZH(2)	To accept A.S.P. for shorter period.	Superintendent.	
96ZH(3)	To determine period of preclusion.	Assistant Collector.	
		Assistant Collector.	

1	2	3	4
96ZH(4)	(i) to accept renewal application in from A.S.P. (ii) to condone and/or determine the period of preclusion.	Superintendent. Superintendent. Assistant Collector. Assistant Collector.	For condoning delay not exceeding 15 days. For condoning delay exceeding 15 days.
96ZI(4)	To condone manner of, and delay in, making payment.	Superintendent. Assistant Collector.	Upto 5 days Beyond the above limit.
96ZA	To condone failure to apply for special procedure.	Deputy Collector.	
97 & 97A	(i) grant of refund and satisfaction of Collector. (ii) extension of period for return of the goods.	Assistant Collector. Deputy Collector.	
100	Collector's power to refund duty.	Assistant Collector.	
140.	(i) Licensing to provide warehousing and demand for fresh Bond/Security. (ii) Revocation of Licence and direction from removal of goods.	Licensing Authority. Assistant Collector.	
145.	Power to extend warehousing period of goods other than tobacco.	or Licensing officer if he is senior in rank to the Assistant Collector. Superintendent. Assistant Collector	Under clause(a) of the rule. Under clause (b) of the rule.
147.	(i) Power regarding remission of duty amounting to: (a) Not exceeding Rs. 1,000/- (b) Exceeding Rs. 1,000/- but not exceeding Rs. 2,500/- (c) Exceeding Rs. 2,500/-but not exceeding Rs. 5,000/- (ii) Power of officer for exercising supervision over destruction.	Superintendent. Assistant Collector. Deputy Collector. Inspector. Superintendent. Assistant Collector.	Upto Rs. 1,000/- Upto Rs. 2,500/- above Rs. 2,500/-
153.	Power to allow in-bond movement and acceptance of bond.	Inspector.	
154 ..	Power to allow in-bond movement of goods and acceptance of bond and demand for fresh bond/ security.	Superintendent.	
164.	(i) Regarding Execution of individual bond. (ii) Regarding Execution of general bond and demand for fresh bond/security/surety.	Superintendent. Assistant Collector.	
165(2)	Demand for advance payment.	Superintendent.	
169	Appointment of warehouse Keeper.	Deputy Collector.	
173G(1A)	Permission to withdraw amount from account current.	Superintendent.	Subject to observance of the procedure prescribed by the Collector.
173G(2)(ii)	Power to permit assessee not to show rate and amount of duty on gate pass.	Deputy Collector.	
173-L & 173-M	(i) Power to extend the period for return of goods. (ii) Collector's other Powers.	Deputy Collector. Assistant Collector.	
173-N(5)	conditions of bond.	Superintendent.	Relaxation regarding storage be granted by the Collector
173-N(6)	Power to extend time for rewarehousing certificate.	Deputy Collector.	
173-O(1)	(i) Power to prescribe marks (ii) Presentation of packages to proper officer within shorter period.	Assistant Collector. Superintendent.	
173-PP(5)	Collector's Power	Assistant Collector.	
173-PPP(6)	Collector's power	Assistant Collector.	
180-	Alteration or substitution of licence.	Licensing authority.	

1	2	3	4
185	(i) Power to permit marketing in any other manner. (ii) Collector's power to prescribe shorter period for presentation of packages.	Assistant Collector Superintendent.	
189, 189A & 189B	Power to sanction refund.	Assistant Collector.	
191		Deputy Collector. Assistant Collector.	
191A	(i) Approval of formula and withdrawal of concession.	Deputy Collector.	
Sub-rule (7)	(ii) other powers of the Collector except power to fix establishment cost and to refuse concession.	Assistant Collector.	
Sub-rule (12)	Extension of time beyond three months } Forfeiture of security. }	Deputy Collector.	
	Other powers of the Collector under Rule 191A except powers under sub-rules (7A) & (16) and refusal of concession.	Assistant Collector.	
191-B	(i) Destruction of waste/refuse and remission of duty	Deputy Collector.	
	(ii) All other powers except powers under sub-rule(4a), refusal of concession and establishment cost.	Assistant Collector.	
192	(i) Power to grant permission.	Officer mentioned in the remission Notification.	
	(ii) Power to issue licence and fixing bond amount and security.	Licensing authority.	
193	Manner of packing.	Assistant Collector.	
196	(i) Withdrawal of concession.	Deputy Collector.	
	(ii) Forfeiture of security and other penal action.	Officer competent to adjudicate.	
	(iii) Powers regarding remission of duty amounting to :—		
	(a) Not exceeding Rs. 1000/-	Superintendent.	
	(b) Exceeding Rs. 1000/- but not exceeding Rs. 2,500/-	Assistant Collector.	
	(c) Exceeding Rs. 2,500/- but not exceeding Rs. 5000/-	Deputy Collector.	
	(iv) Powers of Officer for exercising supervision over destruction.	Inspector Superintendent Assistant Collector	Upto Rs. 1000/- Upto Rs. 2,500/- Above Rs. 2,500/-
196BB	All powers of Collector—	Assistant Collector.	
206(3)	(i) Provisional release of seized vehicles on bond and security.	Assistant Collector or the adjudicating officer lower in rank to the Assistant Collector.	
	(ii) Provisional release of seized goods on bond and security.	Adjudicating officer.	
210-A	Power to compound an offence and fix compounding fee.	(i) Deputy Collector.	Value—without limit compounding fee—not exceeding Rs. 1500/- in each case.
		(ii) Assistant Collector.	Value—upto Rs. 5000/- compounding fee—upto Rs. 750/-
		(iii) Superintendent.	Value—upto Rs. 1000/- compounding fee—upto Rs. 250/-
212	(i) Sale of confiscated goods.	Assistant Collector or the Adjudicating officer if lower in rank to the Assistant Collector.	
	(ii) Destruction of confiscated goods.	Officer competent to write off/ remit value/duty of the goods.	
212A	Payment of storage charges—	Adjudicating officer.	
222	Power to require a new declaration.	Deputy Collector.	
223A	Annual Stocktaking.	Assistant Collector.	
224(1)	Permission to deliver goods beyond fixed hours and on holidays.	Superintendent.	
227	Provision for scales, weights and weighting machines etc.	Assistant Collector.	
229	(i) Power to require office accommodation	Assistant Collector.	
	(ii) Power to require residential accommodation.	Deputy Collector.	
230	Detention of goods, plants and machinery etc.	Assistant Collector.	

वाणिज्य मंत्रालय
(वाणिज्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 13 अगस्त, 1984

का० आ० 2704.—निर्यात (स्वानिर्दिष्ट नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, मैसर्स बजाज आटो लिमिटेड में विनिर्मित, उपाबंध-I में दिए गए मोटर गाड़ी के पुर्जों तथा संघटकों का निर्यात से पूर्व निरीक्षण करने के लिए मैसर्स बजाज आटो लिमिटेड को जिनका रजिस्ट्रिकृत कार्यालय अकूरदी, पूने-411 035 में है, इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए, अभिकरण के रूप में मान्यता देती है, अर्थात् :—

1. कि मैसर्स बजाज आटो लिमिटेड, अकूरदी, पूने में विनिर्मित उपाबंध-I में दिए गए मोटर गाड़ी के पुर्जों और संघटकों का मैसर्स बजाज आटो लिमिटेड निर्यात से पूर्व निरीक्षण करेगी और यह ऐसे अधिकारी के तकनीकी नियंत्रण से किया जाएगा जो निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण बम्बई के अपर निदेशक से कम न हों और इस प्रयोजन के लिए मैसर्स बजाज आटो लिमिटेड अपनी यूनिट मैसर्स बजाज आटो लिमिटेड, पूने से निर्यात की गयी वस्तुओं का पोत-पर्यन्त निःशुल्क (फ्री आन बोर्ड) मूल्य के 0.1% की दर से राशि निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण बम्बई को देगी जो एक वर्ष में कम से कम दो हजार पाँच सौ रुपए और अधिक से अधिक एक लाख रुपए होगी।
2. मैसर्स बजाज आटो लिमिटेड इस अधिसूचना के अधीन अपने कृत्यों के पालन में ऐसे निर्देशों द्वारा आवद्ध होगी जो निदेशक (निरीक्षण और क्वालिटी नियंत्रण) समय-समय पर लिखित रूप में दें।

स्पष्टीकरण : इस अधिसूचना के प्रयोजन के लिए, 'मोटर गाड़ी के पुर्जों, संघटकों तथा उपसाधनों' से मोटर गाड़ियों और ट्रैक्टरों में (चाहे वे यान से संलग्न हों या न हों) प्रयुक्त विनिर्मित उत्पाद हैं जिसमें वे उत्पाद भी सम्मिलित हैं जो इस अधिसूचना के उपाबंध-I में दिए गए मूल उत्पाद के प्रतिस्थापन पुर्जों के रूप में प्रयुक्त किए जाते हैं।

[मिसिल सं० 5/4/84-ई०आई०एंड०ई०पी०]

उपाबंध-I बजाज आटो पर लागू मर्दे

1. संयोजक शलाका
2. ऐक्सल शेफ्ट
3. ब्रेक ड्रम
4. ब्रेक शेफ्ट
5. केम शेफ्ट
6. मिलैण्डर शीप, मिलैण्डर ब्लॉक

7. क्लच समुच्चय
8. वायु फिल्टर समुच्चय तथा इसके फिल्टर तत्व
9. ब्रेक समुच्चय, मास्टर सिलैण्डर उनके पुर्जों तथा मरम्मत का सामान, ब्रेक स्प्रिंग।
10. प्रोपेलर शेफ्ट
11. हब्स
12. व्हील रिम तथा डिस्क समुच्चय।
13. सभी प्रकार के गियर।

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

(Department of Commerce)

New Delhi, the 13th August, 1984

S.O. 2704.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 7 of the Export (Quality Control & Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby recognises M/s. Bajaj Auto Ltd., having their registered office at Akurdi, Pune-411035, as the Agency, for a period of one year from the date of publication of this notification in the official gazette for inspection of automobile spares and components as per Annexure-I manufactured at M/s. Bajaj Auto Ltd., Akurdi, Pune-411035 prior to export subject to the following conditions, namely :—

1. That M/s. Bajaj Auto Ltd., shall carry out the inspection of automobile spares and components as per Annexure-I manufactured at M/s. Bajaj Auto Ltd., Akurdi, Pune prior to export under the technical control of an officer not below the rank of Additional Director of the Export Inspection Agency, Bombay and for this purpose M/s. Bajaj Auto Ltd., shall pay to the Export Inspection Agency, Bombay an amount at the rate of 0.1 per cent of the f.o.b. (free on board) value of the items exported from their unit at M/s. Bajaj Auto Ltd., Pune, subject to a minimum of rupees two thousand five hundred and maximum of rupees one lakh in a year.
2. M/s. Bajaj Auto Ltd., in the performance of its functions under this notification shall be bound by such direction as the Director (Inspection & Quality Control) may give to it in writing from time to time.

Explanation:—For the purpose of this notification 'automobile spares, components and accessories' means the manufactured products used in automobiles and trailers (whether attached to the vehicle or not) including that used as a replacement part for the original product given in Annexure I to this notification.

[F. No. 5/4/84-EI&EP]

ANNEXURE I

1. Connecting Rod
2. Axle Shafts
3. Brake Drum
4. Crankshaft
5. Camshaft
6. Cylinder Head, Cylinder Block
7. Clutch Assembly
8. Air Filter Assembly & its Filter Elements
9. Brake Assembly, Master Cylinder their parts and repair kits, brake springs.
10. Propeller shaft
11. Hubs
12. Wheel Rim and Disc Assembly
13. All types of Gears

का० आ० 2705—निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, मैसर्स उषा माटिन ब्लैक लिमिटेड, तटिसिलवाई, रांची में विनिर्मित इस्पात की तार के रस्सों का निर्यात से पूर्व निरीक्षण करने के लिए मैसर्स उषा माटिन ब्लैक लिमिटेड, को जिनका रजिस्ट्रीकृत कार्यालय 14, प्रिन्सेप स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-700 072 में है, इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहने ए, अधिकरण के रूप में मान्यता देती है अर्थात्:—

1. मैसर्स उषा माटिन ब्लैक लिमिटेड, रांची में विनिर्मित इस्पात के तार के रस्सों का निर्यात से पूर्व मैसर्स उषा माटिन ब्लैक लिमिटेड, निरीक्षण करेगी और यह ऐसे अधिकारी के तकनीकी नियंत्रण में किया जाएगा जिसका पद निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण-कलकत्ता के अपर निदेशक से कम न हो और इस प्रयोजन के लिए मैसर्स उषा माटिन ब्लैक लिमिटेड अपनी यूनिट मैसर्स उषा माटिन ब्लैक लिमिटेड, रांची से निर्यात किए गए इस्पात की तार के रस्सों के पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य (फ्री ऑन बोर्ड) के 0.1 प्रतिशत की दर से राशि निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को देगी जो एक वर्ष में कम से कम दो हजार पाँच सौ रुपये और अधिक से अधिक एक लाख रुपये होंगी।

2. मैसर्स उषा माटिन ब्लैक लिमिटेड इस अधिसूचना के अर्धान अपने कृत्यों के पालन में ऐसे निर्देशों द्वारा आबद्ध होंगी जो निरीक्षण (निर्यात एवं क्वालिटी नियंत्रण) समय-समय पर लिखित रूप में दें।

स्पष्टीकरण—इस अधिसूचना के प्रयोजन के लिए, इस्पात के तार के रस्सों से अभिप्राय फाइबर और सहित अथवा रहित एक विनिर्दिष्ट ढंग की इस्पात की तार को लड़ियों को निजाले से विनिर्मित रस्सी है जहाँ इस्पात की तार को लड़ियों से एक विनिर्दिष्ट ढंग में एक या अधिक तहों में घुरों के चारों ओर गोल या किसी आकार में कुंडलाय रूप में पड़ा रहना अभिप्रेत है और जो ढलाई, घुमाव, उत्तपन, ड्रिल करना या किसी अन्य संबद्ध प्रयोग के लिए वगाई है और उसमें इस्पात की तारियाँ सम्मिलित हैं।

[फाइल नं० 5/2/84-ई०आई०एंड०पी०]

S.O. 2705.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby recognises M/s. Usha Martin Black Limited, having their registered office at 14, Princep Street, Calcutta-700072, as the agency for a period of one year from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette for inspection of steel wire ropes manufactured at M/s. Usha Martin Black Limited, Tatisilwai, Ranchi, prior to export subject to the following conditions, namely:—

1. That M/s. Usha Martin Black Limited, shall carry out the inspection of steel wire ropes manufactured at

M/s. Usha Martin Black Ltd., prior to export under the technical control of an officer not below the rank of Additional Director of the Export Inspection Agency, Calcutta and for this purpose M/s. Usha Martin Black Ltd., shall pay to the export Inspection Agency, Calcutta an amount at the rate of 0.1 per cent of the FOB (free on board) value of the steel wire ropes exported from their unit at M/s. Usha Martin Black Limited, Ranchi, subject to a minimum of rupees two thousand five hundred and maximum of Rupees one lakh in a year.

2. M/s. Usha Martin Black Limited in the performance of its functions under this notification shall be bound by such directions as the Director (Inspection & Quality Control) may give to it in writing from time to time.

Explanation:—For the purposes of this notification 'Steel Wire Ropes' mean ropes manufactured by forming steel wire strands in a specified manner with or without fibre core where steel wire strands means a number of round or shaped steel wires helically laid about an axis in one or more layers in a specified manner and meant for applications such as haulage, winding, hoisting, drilling or for any other allied use and shall include steel wire strands.

[F. No. 5/2/84-EI&EP]

का०आ० 2706—निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, मैसर्स ब्रेक्स (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड, पैडी, मद्रास-600050 में विनिर्मित मोटर गाड़ी के पुर्जों अर्थात् ब्रेक समुच्चय, मास्टर सिलेंडर, व्हील सिलेंडर के पुर्जे तथा मरम्मत के सामान का निर्यात से पूर्व निरीक्षण करने के लिये मैसर्स ब्रेक्स (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड को जिनका रजिस्ट्रीकृत कार्यालय 180, मार्जेंट रोड, मद्रास-600006 में है, इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिये निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन रहने हुए, अधिकरण के रूप में मान्यता देती है, अर्थात्:—

1. कि मैसर्स ब्रेक्स (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड, पैडी, मद्रास-600050 में विनिर्मित मोटर गाड़ी के पुर्जों अर्थात् ब्रेक समुच्चय, मास्टरसिलेंडर, व्हील सिलेंडरों के पुर्जे तथा उनकी मरम्मत के सामान का निर्यात से पूर्व मैसर्स ब्रेक्स (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड निरीक्षण करेगी और यह ऐसे अधिकारी के तकनीकी नियंत्रण में किया जाएगा जिसका पद निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण-मद्रास के अपर निदेशक से कम न हो और इस प्रयोजन के लिए मैसर्स ब्रेक्स (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड अपनी यूनिट मैसर्स ब्रेक्स (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड, पैडी, मद्रास-600050 से निर्यात की गयी वस्तुओं के पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क (एफ ओ बी) मूल्य के 0.1% की दर से राशि निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरण, मद्रास को देगी जो एक वर्ष में कम से कम दो हजार पाँच सौ रुपये और अधिक से अधिक एक लाख रुपये होंगी।

2. मैसर्स ब्रेक्स (इण्डिया) लिमिटेड इस अधिसूचना के अधीन अपने कृत्यों के पालन में ऐसे निर्देशों द्वारा

आवद्ध होगी जो निदेशक (निरीक्षण और क्वालिटी नियंत्रण) समय-समय पर उपनिर्दिष्ट रूप में दें।

स्पष्टीकरण :—इस अधिसूचना के प्रयोजन के लिये 'मोटर गाड़ी के पुर्जों से मोटर गाड़ियों और ट्रेलरों में (चाहे वे यान से संलग्न हों या न हों) प्रयुक्त विनिर्मित, उत्पाद हैं जिनके अन्तर्गत वे उत्पाद जो सम्मिलित हैं जो मूल उत्पाद अर्थात् ब्रेक समूह, मास्टर सिलेंडर, व्हेल सिलेंडर के पुर्जों तथा मरम्मत के सामान के लिये प्रतिस्थापन पुर्जों के रूप में प्रयुक्त किये जाते हैं।

[फाइल सं० 5/3/84-ई०आई०एण्ड ई०पी०]

न० सं० हरिहरन, उप-सचिव

S.O. 2706.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby recognises M/s. Brakes (India) Limited having their registered office at 180, Mount Road, Madras-600006, as the agency, for a period of one year from the date of publication of this Notification in the official Gazette for inspection of automobile spares viz. Brake assembly, Master cylinder, wheel cylinder their parts & repair kits manufactured at M/s. Brakes India Ltd., Padi, Madras 600050 prior to export subject to the following conditions namely :—

1. That M/s. Brakes (India) Limited shall carry out the inspection of automobile spares viz. Brake assembly, Master cylinder, Wheel cylinder their parts & repair kits, manufactured at M/s. Brakes (India) Limited, Padi, Madras-600050 prior to export under the Technical control of an officer not below the rank of Additional Director of the Export Inspection Agency, Madras and for this purpose M/s. Brakes (India) Limited shall pay to the Export Inspection Agency, Madras an amount at the rate of 0.1 per cent of the F.O.B. (free on board) value of the items exported from their unit at M/s. Brakes (India) Ltd., Padi, Madras-600050 subject to a minimum of rupees two thousand five hundred and maximum of rupees one lakh in a year.
2. M/s. Brakes (India) Ltd. in the performance of its functions under this notification shall be bound by such direction as the Director (Inspection & Quality Control) may give to it in writing from time to time.

Explanation.—For the purpose of this Notification 'Automobile spares' means the manufactured products used in automobiles and trailers (whether attached to the vehicle or not) including that used as a replacement part for the original product viz. Brake Assembly, Master cylinder, wheel cylinder their parts & repair kits.

[F. No. 5/3/84-EI&EP]

N. S. HARIHARAN, Dy. Secy.

(मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

नई दिल्ली, 18 जून, 1984

का०आ० 2707.—श्री कमलेश शर्मा, मंत्री, भारतीय राजदूतावास, बोन (पश्चिम जर्मनी) को एक वाक्सवेगेन गोल्फ सी०एन० डीजल कार के आयात के लिये सीमा शुल्क

निकासी परमिट सं० पी/जे/3071671/एन/एन एन/90/एच 83 दिनांक 2-3-84 प्रदान किया गया था। आवेदक ने उपर्युक्त सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट की अनुलिपि प्रति के लिए इस वाचा पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट खो गया है। आगे यह भी बताया है कि मूल सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट किसी भी सीमा शुल्क प्राधिकार के पास पंजीकृत नहीं था जिसने कि सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट प्रस्तुत हो उपर्युक्त में नहीं लाया गया था।

2. अपने तर्क के समर्थन में लाइसेन्सधारी ने उपर्युक्त व्यापक प्राधिकारी के सम्मुख विविध शपथ लेकर एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। तदनुसार मैं संगुप्त हूँ कि मूल सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट सं० पी/जे/3071671 दिनांक 2-3-84 आवेदक से खां रखा है। सामान्यतः पर यथा संगेघ्न आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 के उप-खंड 9(सी सी) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए श्री कमलेश शर्मा के नाम जारी किये गये उक्त मूल सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट सं० पी/जे/3071671 दिनांक 2-3-84 को एतद्वारा रद्द किया किया जाता है।

3. पार्टी को सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट की एक अनुलिपि प्रति अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[सं० जे० ए-217/83-84/बी०एल० एस०/847]

एन० एस० कृष्णावृत्ति, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात निर्यात

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

New Delhi, the 18th June, 1984

S.O. 2707.—Shri Kamallesh Sharma, Ministry, Embassy of India Bonn (West Germany) was granted CCP No. P/J/3071671/N/MN/90/H83 dated 2-3-84 for import of One No. Volkswagen Golf C. L. Diesel Car. The applicant has applied for issue of Duplicate copy of the above mentioned Customs Clearance Permit on the ground that the original C.C.P. has been misplaced. It has further been stated that the original Customs Clearance Permit was not registered with any Customs Authority and as such the Customs Clearance Permit was not utilised at all.

2. In support of his contention, the licensee has filed an affidavit duly sworn before an appropriate judicial authority. I am accordingly satisfied that the original CCP No. P/J/3071671 dated 2-3-84 has been lost by the applicant. In exercise of the powers conferred under Sub-section 9(cc) of the Import (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended from time to time the said original Customs Clearance Permit No. P/J/3071671 dated 2-3-84 issued to Shri Kamlesh Sharma is hereby cancelled.

3. A Duplicate copy of the Customs Clearance Permit is being issued to the party separately.

[No. GA-217 83-84/BLS/847]

N. S. KRISHNAMURTHY, Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

(संयुक्त मुख्य निर्यात आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

(केंद्रीय लाइसेंस क्षेत्र)

नई दिल्ली, 5 जून, 1984

निस्त आदेश

का. आ. 2708—सर्वश्री एम० रांगा सिंह एण्ड कम्पनी, बी-2/7, मॉडल टाउन, देहली की 21,000/- रु. की राशि के लिये एक आयात लाइसेंस सं. 0403259 दिनांक 12-3-83 ड्राई फ्रूट (काजू और खजूर के अतिरिक्त) के आयात हेतु जारी किया गया था। आवेदक फर्म ने यह प्रतिज्ञा किया है कि उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन हेतु कापी बिना किसी कस्टम पर पंजीकृत किये एवं उपयोग किये बिना ही खो गई है / अस्थानस्थ हो गई है।

आवेदक फर्म ने इस कथन के समर्थन में अब एक शपथ पत्र आयात निर्यात की कार्यविधि पुस्तिका 1984-85 के पैरा 352 के अन्तर्गत प्रस्तुत किया है।

मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि उक्त आयात लाइसेंस की मूल कस्टम प्रयोजन कापी खो गई है / अस्थानस्थ हो गई है।

अतः आयात-व्यापार नियंत्रण आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-55 (यथा संशोधित) की धारा 9 (सी) में प्रदत्त प्राधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं उक्त लाइसेंस सं. 0403259 दि. 12-3-83 को मूल कस्टम प्रयोजन कापी को निरस्त करने का आदेश देता हूँ।

आवेदक की प्रार्थना पर अब आयात-निर्यात की कार्यविधि पुस्तिका 1984-85 के पैरा 352 के अनुसार उक्त लाइसेंस सं. 0403259 दि. 12-3-83 को कस्टम प्रयोजन हेतु कापी की अनुलिपि (डुप्लीकेट कापी) जारी करने पर विचार किया जायेगा।

[सं. ड्राईफ्रूट/1925/ए एम-83/ए यू 3/सी एल ए]
ड. प्रार. क्र. ध्वज, उपमुख्य निर्यात, आयात-निर्यात
कृत मुख्य निर्यात, आयात-निर्यात।

(Office of the Joint Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)
(Central Licensing Area)

New Delhi, the 5th June, 1984

CANCELLATION ORDER

S.O. 2708.—M/s. Ranga Singh and Co. B-2/7 Model Town, Delhi was granted Import Licence No. Z/0403259 dated 12-3-1983 for Rs. 21,000 for import of Dry Fruits (excluding Cashew Nuts and Dates). The firm have reported that Custom Copy purposes of the same have been lost/misplaced without having been registered with any Customs Authority and unutilised at all.

The applicant firm has filed an affidavit in support of the above statement as required under para 352 of Hand Book of Import Export Procedure 1984-85. I am satisfied that the original Customs Purposes Copy of the said licence have been lost/misplaced.

In exercise of the powers conferred on me under Section 9(c) of Import Trade Control Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955 I order the cancellation of Custom Copy of the licence. The applicant's case will now be considered for

the issue of Duplicate Licence (Custom Copy) in accordance with para 352 of Hand Book of Rules and Procedure, 1984-85.

[DRY FRUITS/1925/AM. 83/AU. III/CLA]

DR R.K. DHAWAN, Dy. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports. For Jt. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

(संयुक्त मुख्य निर्यात, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

बंगलूर, 26 जून, 1984

लाइसेंस रद्द करने के आदेश

विषय :—सर्वश्री रमेश एक्सपोर्ट प्रा. लि., 45, पैलेस रोड, पी.बी. सं. 5120, बंगलूर-560001 को जारी किए गए सं. पी/जेड/0337294 दिनांक 17-1-1984 की सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति को रद्द करने का आदेश।

कां.आ. 2709.—सर्वश्री रमेश एक्सपोर्ट प्रा. लि., 45 पैलेस रोड, पी.बी. सं. 5120, बंगलूर-560001 को 41840/- रु. मूल्य का आयात लाइसेंस सं. पी/जेड 0337294 दिनांक 17-1-1984 स्टेण्डर्ड इन्डियन किट के साथ रिडक्शन/एनलार्जमेंट प्लेन पेपर कोरियर माडल जोरिक्स 2370 का आयात करने के लिए प्रदान किया गया था। उन्होंने उपर्युक्त सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर अनुरोध किया है कि मूल लाइसेंस किसी भी सीमा शुल्क प्राधिकारी से पंजीकृत कराए बिना और बिल्कुल भी उपयोग किए बिना उनसे खो गया है। अपने अनुरोध के समर्थन में प्रार्थी ने लघु वाद न्यायलय, बंगलूर नगर से विधिवत स्थापित एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है।

तदनुसार मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि 41,840/- रु० के लाइसेंस सं. पी./जेड 0337294 दिनांक 17-1-1984 की सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति दोनों खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है और प्रार्थी फर्म को उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि जारी की जाए।

उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति और मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति को एतद्वारा रद्द किया जाता है।

[निस्त सं. आईटीसी/एयू/अन्य/ओएम/263/ए एम-84/बंग]

श. तुक्का राम, उप-मुख्य निर्यात, आयात-निर्यात
कृत मुख्य निर्यात, आयात निर्यात

(Office of the Joint Chief Controller of Import and Exports)

Bangalore, the 26th June, 1984

CANCELLATION ORDER

Sub :- Cancellation of Customs Purpose Copy and Exchange Control Purpose Copy of Import Licence P/Z 0337294 dated 17-1-1984 for Rs. 41,840/- issued in favour of M/s. Ramash Exports Pvt. Ltd., 45, Palace Road, P. B. No. 5120 Bangalore-560001.

S.O. 2709.—M/s. Ramesh Exports Pvt. Ltd., 45 Palace Road, P. B. No. 5120, Bangalore-560001 have been granted an Import Licence No. P/Z 0337294 dated 17-1-1984 for Rs. 41,840 for import of Model Xerox 2370 Reduction/Enlargement Plain Paper Copies with Standard Initial Kit. They have requested for issue of duplicate copy of Customs Purpose Copy and Exchange Control Purpose Copy of the said licence on the ground that the original licence have been lost without having been registered with any customs authority and not realised at all. In support of their request, the applicant have filed an Affidavit duly sworn before the Court of Small Causes, Bangalore City.

I am satisfied that both the Customs Purpose copy and Exchange Control Purpose Copy of the licence No. P/Z 0337294 dated 17-1-1984 for Rs. 41,840 have been lost/misplaced and that a duplicate customs purpose copy and Exchange Control Purpose Copy of the said licence may be issued to the applicant firm.

The original Customs purposes copy and Exchange Control Purpose copy of the said licence is hereby cancelled.

[File No. ITC/AU/OTHERS/OM/263/AM-84/Bang]

A. THUKKARAM, Dy. C. C. I & E

for Joint Chief Controller of Imports & Exports

(संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक आयात, निर्यात का कार्यालय)

हैदराबाद, 5 जुलाई, 1984

रद्द करने का आदेश

कां०आ० 2710.—ए एम 84 की नीति के अनुसार परिशिष्ट 7 के अन्तर्गत सम्मिलित लोहा तथा इस्पात के वस्तुओं के आयात के लिए मेसर्स हिन्दुस्तान मोनार्क प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, सनतनगर, हैदराबाद, के नाम एक आयात लाइसेंस संख्या—पी/डी/22325161/सी/XX/90/डब्ल्यू/83 दिनांक 13-2-84 रु० 7,48,000 के/पीआईएफ० मूल्य का जारी किया गया था। उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस का मुद्रा विनियम की मूल प्रति गुप्त/गलत जगह पर रखे जाने के कारण पार्टी ने मुद्रा विनियम की दूसरी प्रति जारी करने का अनुरोध किया है। अब उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की मुद्रा विनियम की दूसरी प्रति भी अपेक्षित है उसका कुल मूल्य रु० 5,78,076 (पांच लाख अठहत्तर हजार छिहत्तर रुपये) होगा।

अपने दावे के समर्थन में आवेदनकर्ता ने मोहर युक्त कागज पर लेख्य प्रमाणक द्वारा सत्यापित शपथ पत्र दायर किया है। आवेदनकर्ता ने यह भी आश्वासन दिया है कि मुद्रा विनियम की मूल प्रति गुप्त/गलत जगह पर रखी गई है और आवेदनकर्ता को मुद्रा विनियम की दूसरी प्रति जारी किये जाये। लाइसेंस संख्या: पी/डी/2232546/सी/XX/90/डब्ल्यू/83

मुझे संतुष्टि हुई है कि लाइसेंस संख्या: पी/डी/2232546/सी/XX/90/डब्ल्यू/83 दिनांक 13-2-84, को मुद्रा विनियम की मूल प्रति गुप्त/गलत जगह पर रखी गई है और आवेदनकर्ता को मुद्रा विनियम की दूसरी प्रति जारी किये जाये। लाइसेंस संख्या: पी/डी/2232546/सी/XX/90/डब्ल्यू/83

83 दिनांक 13-2-84 की मुद्रा विनियम की मूल प्रति, इसके द्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

[मिमिन संख्या : आई टी सी/ए यू/डी जी टी डी/200/83-84-
हैदराबाद]

आर० सेल्वराज, उप मुख्य नियंत्रक
आयात-निर्यात

(Office of the Jt. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

Hyderabad, the 5th July, 1984

CANCELLATION ORDER

S.O. 2710.—M/s. Hindustan Monark Private Ltd., Sanathnagar, Hyderabad were granted an Import Licence bearing No. P/D/2232546/C/XX/90/W/83 dated 13th February, 1984 for a c.i.f. value of Rs. 7,48,000 for import of Iron & Steel items specified in Appendix 7 of Import Policy Book for AM 84 period. The party has applied for grant of duplicate Exchange Control copy of the abovesaid import licence on the ground that the original Exchange Control Copy of the licence has been lost/misplaced. The total amount for which the duplicate Exchange Control Copy of the licence is required for a value of Rs. 5,78,076 (Rupees Five lakhs Seventy Eight Thousand and Seventy Six only).

In support of their contention the applicant has filed an affidavit on stamped paper duly attested by a Notary. The applicant has also undertaken to return the licensing authority concerned the original Exchange Control Copy of licence, if the same is traced or found later on.

I am satisfied that the original Exchange Control Copy of Licence No. P/D/2232546/C/XX/90/W/83 dated 13th February, 1984 has been lost/misplaced and that duplicate Exchange Control Copy of licence should be issued to the applicant. The original Exchange Control Copy of Licence No. P/D/2232546/C/XX/90/W/83 dated 13th February, 1984 is hereby cancelled.

[File No. ITC/AU/DGID/260/83-84/HYD]

R. SELVARAJ, Dy. Chief Controller of I&E

(मुख्य नियंत्रक आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय)

नई दिल्ली, 24 जुलाई, 1984

आदेश

कां०आ० 2711.—रेव०सी०ए० वेक्टो०एम०जे० मेन्टर फार् एजुकेशन रिसर्च एंड सर्विसिज, नवदीप्ति मदन, सेट, जेवियर, एम० कैम्पस, पटना को सामान्य मुद्रा क्षेत्र के अन्तर्गत हैट्र हेलप कैलकुलेटर के लिए 1000 पी सी एक प्रिंटर असेम्बली के आयात के लिए 1530 रु० का सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट सं० पी०/जे/3051486/एन/एम एन/90/H/83/ए एन एस दिनांक 2-2-1984 प्रदान किया गया था। आवेदक ने उपर्युक्त सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट की अनुलिपि प्रति के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट खो गया है/अस्थानस्थ हो गया है। प्राप्ति यह भी बताया गया है कि सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट किसी भी सीमा शुल्क प्राधिकारी के पास पंजीकृत नहीं था और इसलिए सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट के प्रत्येक को बिल्कुल भी उपयोग में नहीं लाया गया था।

2. अपने तर्कों के समर्थन में लाइसेंसधारी ने नोटरी पब्लिक दिल्ली के सम्मुख विधिवत शपथ लेकर स्टाम्प कागज

पर एक अपय एवं दखिल किया है। तदनुसार, प्रबोद्धाधारी संतुष्ट है कि मूल सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट सं० पी/जे/3051486/एन/एम एन/90/एच/83/ए, एन एस दिनांक 2-2-1984 आवेदक से खो गया है/अन्त्यस्त हो गया है। समय समय पर यथा सहायित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 के उप खंड 9(सी सी) के अंतर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारी का प्रयोग करते हुए, सी ए, रेविरो को जारी किया गया उक्त मूल सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट सं० पी/जे/3051486/एन/एम एन/90/एच/83/ए, एन एस दिनांक 2-2-1984 एतद्वारा रद्द किया जाता है।

3 पार्श्व को सीमा शुल्क निकासी परमिट की एक अनुरूपि प्रति अग्रे से जारी की जा रही है।

[सं० 9/55/ए एन-84/ए एन एस/472]

एन०एस० कृष्णामूर्ति, उप मुख्य नियंत्रक आयात-निर्यात

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

New Delhi, the 24th July, 1984

ORDER

S.O. 2711.—Rev. C. A. Rebeiro, S. J. Centre For Educational Research & Services Navdeepthi Sadan, St. Xavier, S. Camp's Patna was granted a CCP No. P/J/3051486/NMN/9/83/ALS dated 2nd February, 1984 for Rs. 1530 for import of one No. Printer Accessory, PC 1000 for a Hand Help Calculator under GCA. The applicant has applied for issue of a duplicate copy of the above mentioned CCP on the ground that the original CCP has been lost/misplaced. It has further been stated that the CCP was not registered with any Customs Authority and as such the value of CCP has not been utilised at all.

2. In support of this contention, the licensee has filed an affidavit on stamped paper duly sworn in before a Notary Public Delhi. The undersigned is accordingly satisfied that the original CCP No. P/J/3051486/NMN/9/83/ALS dated 2nd February, 1984 has been lost/misplaced. In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-clause 9(cc) of the Import (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7th December, 1955 as amended from time to time, the said original CCP No. P/J/3051486/NMN/90/H/83/ALS dated 2nd February, 1984 issued to Rev. C. A. Rebeiro is hereby cancelled.

3. A duplicate copy of CCP is being issued to the party separately.

[No. 9/55/AM. 84/ALS/472]

N. S. KRISHNAMURTHY, Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

विदेश मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 3 अगस्त, 1984

का०आ० 2712.—राजनयिक एवं कौंसली अधिकारी (शपथ एवं शुल्क) अधिनियम, 1948 की धारा 2 के खंड (क) के अन्वय में केन्द्र सरकार इसके द्वारा, केंद्र स्थित भारतीय राजदूतावास में सहायक श्री मा०एस० शर्मा, श्री ए०एस० रामास्वामी और श्री जे० के० मथ्यु, को 1 अगस्त, 1984 से कौंसली एजेंट का कार्य करने के लिये प्राधिकृत करती है।

[सं० टी०-4330/2/84]

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 31st August, 1984

S.O. 2712.—In pursuance of the clause (a) of Section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and Fees) Act, 1948 (41 of 1948), the Central Government hereby authorise Shri C. S. Sharma, Shri A. S. Ramaswamy and Shri J. K. Mathew all Assistants in the Assistant High Commission of India, Kandy to perform the duties of Consular Agents w.e.f. 1-8-84

[No. T-4330/2/84]

का०आ० 2713.—राजनयिक एवं कौंसली अधिकारी (शपथ एवं शुल्क) अधिनियम, 1948 की धारा 2 के खंड (क) के अन्वय में केन्द्र सरकार इसके द्वारा, लुसाका स्थित भारतीय उच्चायोग में प्रथम सचिव के निजी सहायक श्री जे० सी० कपूर को 25-7-1984 से कौंसली एजेंट का कार्य करने के लिये प्राधिकृत करती है।

[सं० टी०-4330/2/84]

S.O. 2713.—In pursuance of clause (a) of Section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and Fees) Act, 1948 (41 of 1948), the Central Government hereby authorise Shri J. C. Kapoor, Personal Assistant to First Secretary in the High Commission of India, Lusaka to perform the duties of Consular Agent w.e.f. 25-7-1984.

[No. T-4330/2/84]

का० आ० 2714.—राजनयिक एवं कौंसली अधिकारी (शपथ एवं शुल्क) अधिनियम, 1948 की धारा 2 के खंड (क) के अन्वय में केन्द्र सरकार इसके द्वारा, बहरीन स्थित भारतीय राजदूतावास में सहायक श्री आर० के० महाजन को 25 जुलाई, 1984 से कौंसली एजेंट का कार्य करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[सं० टी० 4330/2/84]

बी० एस० निडर, अवसर सचिव

S.O. 2714.—In pursuance of clause (a) of Section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and Fees) Act, 1948 (41 of 1948), the Central Government hereby authorise Shri R. K. Mahajan, Assistant in the Embassy of India, Bahrain w.e.f. 25-7-84 to perform the duties of Consular Agent.

[No. T-4330/2/84]

B. S. NIDAR, Under Secy.

ऊर्जा मंत्रालय

(पेट्रोलियम विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 31 जुलाई, 1984

का०आ० 2715.—तेल उद्योग (विकास) अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 47) के खण्ड 3 उपखण्ड (3) की धारा (ग) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और ऊर्जा मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की दिनांक 15 सितम्बर, 1983 की अधिसूचना संख्या का०आ० 3689 में प्राणित रूप में प्रकाशित करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा मेजर जनरल एस०सी०एन० जटार, अध्यक्ष एवं प्रबन्ध निदेशक आयल इंडिया लिमिटेड को अपने पद की हैभियत से, तेल उद्योग के कार्य में लगी निगमों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने के

लिए श्री एस० जगन्नाथन के स्थान पर, तेल उद्योग विकास बोर्ड के सदस्य के रूप में तत्काल आधार से 2 वर्षों की अवधि के लिए नियुक्त करती है।

[फाइल संख्या 7/10/82-विन II]

जे० मण्डल, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF ENERGY

(Department of Petroleum)

New Delhi, the 31st July, 1984

S.O. 2715.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (3) of section 3 of the Oil

Industry (Development) Act, 1974 (47 of 1974) and in partial modification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Energy (Department of Petroleum) notification No. S. O. 3689 dated the 15th September, 1983, the Central Government hereby appoints, with immediate effect and for a period not exceeding two years, Maj. Gen. S. C. N. Jatar, Chairman and Managing Director, Oil India Ltd., as a member of the Oil Industry Development Board by virtue of his office to represent the Corporations engaged in oil industry, vice Shri C. R. Jagannathan.

[No. 7/10/82-Fin.II]

J. MANDAL, Director.

नई दिल्ली, 3 अगस्त, 1984

का०आ० 2716.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में हाजिरा, बरेली, जगदीशपुर पाइपलाइन प्रोजेक्ट तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आणख्य एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

वर्शों कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग बी-58 बी, अलीगंज लखनऊ, यूपी-226020 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टतः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसाई की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	परगना	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या	निया गया क्षेत्रफल एकड़ में	विवरण
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
झांसी	झांसी	झांसी	पुनावलीकलां	2508	0	21
				2509	0	58
				2510	0	02
				2513	0	43
				2514	0	38
				2515	0	02

	5	6
	2518	1 18
	2596	0 09
	2597	0 04
	2598	0 09
	2614	1 14
	2619	0 01
	2624	0 17
	2625	0 10
	2626	0 07
	2733	0 02
	3042	0 03
	3043	0 35
	3046	0 10
	3048	0 15
	2623	0 02
	2616	0 02
	योग	5 51 एकड़

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	परगना	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या	लिया गया क्षेत्रफल एकड़ में	विवरण
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
झांसी	झांसी	झांसी	परासई	2/2	0 20	
				9	0 70	
				10	0 10	
				12	0 18	
				14/1	0 50	
				16	0 65	
				17	0 05	
				18	0 20	
				19/1	0 50	
				20	0 17	
				21	0 08	
				22	0 09	
				23	0 38	
				26	0 05	
			योग		3 85	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
भांसी	भासी	भासी	बछीनी			
				489	0	70
				555	0	85
				556	0	14
				559	0	25
				560	0	55
				563	0	25
				565	0	20
				566	0	70
				617	0	10
				618	0	60
				619/1	0	20
				639/3	1	40
				642	0	07
				1135	0	40
				1131	0	25
				1132	0	13
				1130	0	17
				1103	0	25
				1104	0	10
				1101	0	45
				1100	0	50
				1107	0	22
				1108	0	50
				1109	0	30
				1189	0	30
				1190	0	35
				1191	0	20
				1193	0	90
				1195	0	25
				1197	0	65
				1055	0	35
				1054	0	01
				1052/1	0	60
				1051	0	07
				1048	1	30
				1047	0	40
				1026	0	18
				1024	0	60
				1022	0	90
				1019	1	02
				1020	0	02
				1016	0	02
				1134	0	10
				1125	0	05
				1018	0	01

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
झांसी	झांसी	झांसी	पलीदा	6/1	0 26	
				13 के एच ए	0 36	
				11	0 32	
				15	0 34	
				16	0 20	
				17	0 34	
				18	0 90	
				27	0 30	
				28	0 13	
				29	0 06	
				104	0 08	
				105	0 70	
				106	0 08	
योग					4 27 एकड़	

[स. O-12016/96/84-धो० एम० जी० डी-4]

New Delhi, the 3rd August, 1984

S.O. 2716.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Hazira to Bareilly Jagdishpur Pipeline Project in Uttar Pradesh State Pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, it exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the section 3 of the Petroleum and

Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, H. B. J. Pipeline Project B-58/B, Aliganj, Lucknow U. P. (225020).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Gatta No.	Area taken Acres	Remarks
Jhansi	Jhansi	Jhansi	Palinda	6/1	0 26	
				13 Kha	0 56	
				14	0 32	
				15	0 34	
				16	0 20	
				17	0 34	
				18	0 90	
				27	0 30	
				28	0 13	
				29	0 06	
				104	0 08	
				105	0 70	
				106	0 08	
Total					4 27 Acres	

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Plot No.	Area acquired in acres		Remarks
Jhansi	Jhansi	Jhansi	Bachhaun	489	0	70	
				555	0	85	
				556	0	14	
				559	0	25	
				560	0	55	
				563	0	25	
				565	0	20	
				556	0	70	
				617	0	10	
				618	0	60	
				619/1	0	20	
				639/3	1	40	
				642	0	07	
				1135	0	40	
				1131	0	25	
				1132	0	13	
				1130	0	17	
				1103	0	25	
				1104	0	10	
				1101	0	45	
				1100	0	50	
				1107	0	22	
				1108	0	50	
				1109	0	30	
				1189	0	30	
				1190	0	35	
				1191	0	20	
				1193	0	90	
				1195	0	25	
				1197	0	65	
				1055	0	35	
				1054	0	01	
				1052/1	0	60	
				1051	0	07	
				1048	1	30	
				1047	0	40	
				1026	0	18	
				1024	0	60	
				1022	0	90	
				1019	1	02	
				1020	0	02	
				1016	0	02	
				1134	0	10	
				1125	0	05	
				1018	0	01	
Total				17 56 Acres			

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Plot No.	Area acquired in acres		Remarks
Jhansi	Jhansi	Jhansi	Parasai	2/2	0	20	
				9	0	70	
				10	0	10	
				12	0	18	
				14/1	0	50	
				16	0	65	
				17	0	05	
				18	0	20	
				19/1	0	50	
				20	0	17	
				21	0	08	
				22	0	09	
				23	0	38	
				26	0	05	
				Total	3	85	Acres

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Paragana	Village	Plot No.	Area acquired in acres		Remarks
Jhansi	Jhansi	Jhansi	Punawali Kalan	2508	0	21	
				2509	0	58	
				2510	0	02	
				2513	0	43	
				2514	0	38	
				2515	0	02	
				2518	1	18	
				2596	0	09	
				2597	0	04	
				2598	0	09	
				2614	1	14	
				2619	0	01	
				2624	0	17	
				2625	0	40	
				2626	0	07	
				2733	0	02	
				3042	0	02	
				3043	0	35	
				3046	0	10	
				3048	0	15	
				2623	0	02	
				2616	0	02	
				Total	5	51	Acres

[No. O-12016/96/84-ONG-D-4]

का०आ० 2717:—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में हजीरा-वरेली-जगदीशपुर पाइपलाइन प्रोजेक्ट तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वारा अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) (अधिनियम, 1982) (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आण्य एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग बी० 58/बी०, अलीगज, लखनऊ, यू०पी०-226020 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी मुनबाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसाई की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	परगना	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या	लिया गया क्षेत्रफल			टिप्पणी
					बि०	बि०	बि०	
रायबरेली	महाराजगंज	बछरावां	रेन	494	0	13	4	
				195	0	1	15	
				198	0	0	16	
				197	0	2	10	
				192	0	12	12	
				191	0	1	15	
				199	0	1	15	
				190	1	9	0	
				188	0	17	4	
				183	0	11	8	
				212	0	1	4	
				213	0	13	12	
				175	0	19	4	
				174	0	1	15	
				226	0	0	15	
				173	0	11	16	
				171	1	2	4	
				172	0	1	16	
				170	0	10	4	
				169	0	1	4	
				243	0	2	14	
				104	0	0	10	
				76	0	7	4	
				168	0	10	14	
				166	0	1	4	
				165	0	12	12	
				163	0	5	10	
				105	0	12	13	
				107	0	0	10	
				108	0	11	15	
				120	0	15	0	
				121	0	8	10	
				129	0	14	10	
				128	0	5	0	
				127	0	0	15	
				133	0	1	5	
				132	0	8	5	
				131	0	0	8	

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	परगना	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या	लिया गया क्षेत्रफल			टिप्पणी
					बि०	बि०	बि०	
रायबरेली	महाराजगंज	बछरावां	रन	196	0	0	15	
				205	0	3	0	
				203	0	2	5	
				184	0	1	4	
				164	0	2	0	
				146	0	2	0	
				216	0	1	4	
				75	0	4	0	
				119	0	0	15	
				116	0	0	10	
				117	0	0	10	
				162	0	0	18	
				114	0	0	5	
				269	0	0	10	
				94	0	1	0	
			किता	53	15	15	8	
					(9-856)		(3-9917)	
					एकड़		हेक्टर	

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	परगना	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या	लिया गया क्षेत्रफल			टिप्पणी
					बि०	बि०	बि०	
1	2	3	4	5	6			7
रायबरेली		बछरावां	शेखपुर समोधा	2351	1	1	0	
				2352	1	16	0	
				2437	2	11	0	
				2438	0	4	10	
				किता 4	5	12	10	
					(3-516)			
					एकड़			
					(1-4237)			
					हेक्टेयर			

अनुसूची

जिला	परगना	तहसील	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या	लिया गया क्षेत्रफल			टिप्पणी
					बि०	बि०	बि०	
1	2	3	4	5	6			7
रायबरेली	बछरावा	महाराजगंज	जलालपुर	680	0	0	9	
				681	0	15	0	
				686	0	2	2	
				694	0	13	0	
				696	0	0	15	
				695	0	0	10	
				700	0	5	10	
				708	0	1	0	
				709	0	5	0	
				710	0	11	12	
				711	0	3	15	
				718	0	0	10	
				920	1	16	0	
				921	1	4	15	
				927	0	8	15	
				946	0	2	0	
				949	0	1	15	
				950	0	6	16	
				951	0	10	3	
				952	0	0	5	
				964	0	0	5	
				965	0	1	10	
				966	0	3	0	
				967	0	3	6	
				973	0	7	10	
				978	0	3	10	
				979	0	5	10	
				980	0	1	6	
				981	0	1	10	
				982	0	3	3	
				983	0	0	10	
				984	0	0	10	
				985	0	0	10	
				993	0	1	0	
				किता 34	9	2	12 (5.706)	
				एकड़				
				(2--3091) हेक्टेयर				

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	परगना	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या	लिया गया क्षेत्रफल			टिप्पणी
					बि०	बि०	बि०	
रायबरेली		बछरावा	रमूलपुर	618	0	14	2	
				638	0	14	10	
				644	0	1	14	
				645	0	4	19	
				646	0	0	15	
				647	0	5	5	
				648	0	1	5	
				650	0	4	0	
				651	0	2	10	
				652	0	12	4	
				653	0	4	2	
				661	0	16	15	
				713	1	8	0	
				714	0	19	5	
				717	0	19	4	
				743	0	2	8	
				744	0	1	10	
				745	0	13	19	
				746	0	3	0	
				747	0	2	6	
				749	0	3	0	
				750	0	5	0	
				751	0	2	5	
				752	0	1	15	
				753	0	2	8	
				754	0	1	5	
				763	0	0	15	
				764	0	7	11	
				767	0	8	2	
				768	0	1	4	
				769	0	0	10	
				703	0	0	6	
				748	0	0	10	
				33	10	6	4	(6-444)
				(2-6096) हेक्टेयर				एकड़

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	परगना	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या	लिया गया क्षेत्रफल			टिप्पणी
					बि०	बि०	बि०	
1	2	3	4	5	6			
रायबरेली		बछरावां	उचौरी	457	0	3	0	
				1304	0	2	16	
				1305	1	1	10	
				1306	0	1	7	
				1307	1	2	0	
				कुल 5	2	10	13	
							(1.583) एकड़	
			(-6407) हेक्टर					

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	परगना	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या	लिया गया क्षेत्रफल			टिप्पणी
					बि०	बि०	बि०	
1	2	3	4	5	6			7
रायबरेली	महाराजगंज	बछराबा	दरेहटा	182	0	0	15	
				183	0	3	0	
				184	0	7	10	
				185	0	8	0	
				4	0	19	5	
					(. 602) एकड़			
					(-2436) हेक्टर			

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	परगना	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या	लिया गया क्षेत्रफल	टिप्पणी
					वि० वि० वि०	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
रायबरेली		इन्हौना	ओतिया	359 मि०	0 12 0	
				किला 1	0 12 0	
					(0-375) एकड़	
					(0-1518) हेक्टर	

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	परगना	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या	लिया गया क्षेत्रफल बि० बि० बि०			टिप्पणी
1	2	3	4	5	6			7
रायबरेली	महाराजगंज	हरदोई	पाराकला	6	1	2	14	
				12	0	10	0	
				11	0	7	10	
				18	1	17	15	
				19	0	2	0	
				14	0	0	5	
				13	0	7	0	
				16	0	7	8	
				20	0	8	10	
				9	5	3	2	
					(3-222) एकड़			
					(1-3047) हेक्टर			

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	परगना	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या	लिया गया क्षेत्रफल बि० बि० बि०			टिप्पणी
रायबरेली		सेमरौता	मानगांव	535	0	1	0	
				537	0	16	10	
				538	0	2	10	
				847				
				550	0	6	0	
				552	0	16	10	
				569	0	0	10	
				568	0	16	10	
				534	0	7	10	
				849				
				538	0	6	10	
				551	1	11	0	
				567	0	2	10	
				534	2	19	0	
				12	7	6	0	
					(4-562) एकड़			
					(1.8479) हेक्टेयर			

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	परगना	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या	लिया गया क्षेत्रफल बि० बि० बि०			टिप्पणी
1	2	3	4	5	6			7
रायबरेली	महाराजगंज	इन्हीना	रामपुर पवाश	815	0	0	4	
				835	0	7	0	
				836	1	1	0	
				839	0	0	9	
				847	0	0	4	
				848	0	17	0	
				849	0	15	6	
				850	0	13	0	
				861	0	9	16	
				862	1	0	8	
				864	0	1	10	
				874	0	3	18	
				876	0	2	15	
				884	1	4	0	
				885	0	3	3	
				886	0	12	0	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
				887	0	4	0
				988	0	1	5
				890	0	1	2
				896	0	5	0
				823	0	4	5
				837	0	1	2
				851	0	1	16
				853	0	1	12
				863	0	0	8
				870	0	1	5
				875	0	6	0
				877	0	11	19
				889	0	11	5
				903	0	4	5
				किता 30	10	6	17
					(6-464) एकड़		
					(2-6179) हेक्टर		

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	परगना	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या	लिया गया क्षेत्रफल बि०	बि०	बि०	टिप्पणी
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
रायबरेली		इन्हीना	शेरवनगाँव	2	0	2	5	
				7	1	18	0	
				9	0	12	0	
				10	0	4	5	
				11	0	6	0	
				19	0	7	0	
				20	1	17	0	
				24	0	15	0	
				25	0	1	10	
				188	0	1	2	
				189	0	2	5	
				49	0	4	10	
				50	0	0	10	
				52	0	0	10	
				197	0	3	0	
				198	1	4	10	
				199	0	0	5	
				209	0	0	10	
				218	0	0	8	
				219	0	6	10	
				220	0	0	6	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
				21	0	5	10
				221	2	2	0
				23	11	0	10
					6-266 एकड़ (2-7905) हेक्टर		

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	परगना	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या	लिया गया क्षेत्रफल		टिप्पणी				
					बि.	वि.	वि.				
1	2	3	4	5	6		7				
रायबरेली	महाराजगंज	इन्हौना	पन्हौना	2691	0	4	0				
				2692	0	10	16				
				2693	0	3	4				
				2694	1	0	4				
				2703	0	3	4				
				2704	0	6	8				
				2705	0	5	0				
				2706	0	10	14				
				2707	0	2	10				
				2708	0	0	12				
				2715	0	3	18				
				2718	0	6	0				
				2719	0	5	19				
				2720	0	3	4				
				2721	0	10	0				
				2722	0	0	1				
				2723	0	3	12				
				2782	0	14	8				
				2783	0	17	0				
				2787	0	20	0				
				2791	0	4	0				
				2792	0	3	5				
				2793	0	4	0				
				2794	0	13	0				
				2795	0	7	0				
				2799	0	1	15				
				2800	0	6	0				
				2801	0	6	0				
				2802	0	2	5				
				2803	0	0	3				
				किता 30				9	0	2	
								(5-625) एकड़			
								(2-2794) हेक्टर			

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	परगना	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या	लिया गया क्षेत्रफल			टिप्पणी
					बि.	बि.	बि.	
1	2	3	4	5	6			7
रायबरेली	बछगवाँ	सैदपुर बेहटा	23	2	5	0		
			24	0	8	0		
			25	0	4	0		
			20	0	3	0		
			35	0	2	0		
			37	0	9	0		
			38	0	18	13		
			39	0	18	0		
			36	0	9	0		
			59	0	5	0		
			60	0	9	0		
			57	1	9	0		
			58	0	12	0		
			62	0	2	0		
			56	0	3	0		
			53	0	1	0		
			51	0	4	0		
			52	0	8	0		
			50	0	2	0		
			145	0	3	0		
			152	0	0	6		
			149	1	15	0		
			148	0	8	0		
			19	0	5	0		
किता 24				12	2	19		
				(7-592) एकड़				
				(3-0752) हेक्टेयर				

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	परगना	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या	लिया गया क्षेत्रफल			टिप्पणी
					बि.	बि.	बि.	
1	2	3	4	5	6			7
रायबरेली	इन्हीना	राजापुर		8 मि.	0	5	10	
				9 "	0	12	10	
				10 "	0	8	5	
				11 "	0	0	18	
				12 "	0	6	3	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
				13 मि.	0	8 5
				14 "	0	0 15
				18 "	0	4 0
				19 "	0	2 15
				20 "	0	5 0
				21 "	0	15 0
				22 "	0	0 2
				48 "	0	14 0
				किता 13	4	3 3
					(2-598) एकड़	
					(1-0524) हेक्टेयर	

अनुसूची

जिला	तहसील	परगना	ग्राम	गाटा संख्या वि.	लिया गया वि.	क्षेत्रफल वि.	टिप्पणी
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
रायबरेली	महाराजगंज	सेमरौता	भइयापुर	19	0	9 0	
				20	0	1 10	
				22	0	4 5	
				28	0	10 15	
				29	1	4 0	
				30	0	2 15	
				31	0	3 5	
				33	1	19 0	
				38	0	15 0	
				39	0	4 15	
				40	1	3 15	
				41	0	4 0	
				46	0	8 0	
				49	0	10 10	
				52	0	1 0	
				76	0	2 10	
				77	1	7 0	
				17	9	11 0	
					(5-969) एकड़		
					(2-4075) हेक्टेयर		

ह./तहसीलदार सहायक लाइजन्स आफिसर,
ओ. एन. जी. सी., अलीगंज,
लखनऊ।

S.O. 2717.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Hazira to Bareilly Jagdishpur Pipeline Project in Uttar Pradesh State Pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, it exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals

Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, H.B.J. Pipeline Project B-58/B, Aliganj, Lucknow-U. P. (226020).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Gata No.	Area taken			Remarks
					B.	B.	B.	
Raebareli	Máhráj Ganj	Bachhrawan	Ráin	494	0	13	4	
				195	0	1	15	
				198	0	0	16	
				197	0	2	10	
				192	0	12	12	
				191	0	1	15	
				199	0	1	15	
				190	1	9	0	
				188	0	17	4	
				183	0	11	8	
				212	0	1	4	
				213	0	13	12	
				175	0	19	4	
				174	0	1	15	
				226	0	0	15	
				173	0	11	16	
				171	1	2	4	
				172	0	1	16	
				170	0	10	4	
				169	0	1	4	
				243	0	2	14	
				104	0	0	10	
				76	0	7	4	
				168	0	10	14	
				166	0	1	4	
				165	0	12	12	
				163	0	5	10	
				105	0	12	13	
				107	0	0	10	
				108	0	11	15	
				120	0	15	0	
				121	0	8	10	
				129	0	14	10	
				128	0	5	0	
				127	0	0	15	
				133	0	1	5	
				132	0	8	5	
				131	0	0	8	

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Gata No.	Area taken			Remarks				
					B.	B.	B.					
Raebareli	Mahraj Ganj	Bachhrawan	Ram	196	0	0	15					
				205	0	3	02					
				203	0	2	5					
				184	0	1	4					
				164	0	2	0					
				146	0	2	0					
				216	0	1	4					
				75	0	4	0					
				119	0	0	15					
				116	0	0	10					
				167	0	0	10					
				162	0	0	18					
				114	0	0	5					
				269	0	0	10					
				94	0	1	94					
				Total					53	15	15	8 (9.856) Acres
									(3.9917)			Hectares.

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Gata No.	Area taken			Remarks			
					B.	B.	B				
Raebareli	Maharajganj	Bachhrawan	Sheikhpur Samodha	2351	1	1	0				
				2352	1	16	0				
				2437	2	11	0				
				2438	0	4	10				
				Total					4	5	12 10 (3 516) Acres
				(1.4237) Hectares							

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Gata No.	Area taken			Remarks
					B.	B.	B.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Raebareli	Maharajganj	Bachhrawan	Jalalpur	680	0	0	9	
				681	0	15	0	
				686	0	2	2	
				694	0	13	0	
				696	0	0	15	
				695	0	0	10	
				700	0	5	10	
				708	0	1	0	
				709	0	5	0	
				710	0	11	12	
				711	0	3	15	
				718	0	0	10	
				920	1	16	0	
				921	1	4	15	
				927	0	8	15	
				946	0	2	0	
				949	0	1	15	
				950	0	6	16	
				951	0	10	3	
				952	0	0	5	
				964	0	0	5	
				965	0	1	10	
				966	0	3	0	

	5	6	7	8	
	967	0	3	6	
	973	0	7	10	
	978	0	3	10	
	979	0	5	10	
	980	0	1	6	
	981	0	1	10	
	982	0	3	3	
	983	0		10	
	984	0	0	10	
	985	0	0	10	
	993	0	1	0	
Total	34	9	2	12	(5.706) Acres

(2 3091) Heactere

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Gata No.	Area taken			Remarks
					B	B.	B.	
Raebareli	Maharajganj	Bachhiawan	Rasulpur	618	0	14	2	
				638	0	14	10	
				644	0	1	14	
				645	0	4	19	
				646	0	0	15	
				647	0	5	05	
				648	0	1	5	
				650	0	4	0	
				651	0	2	10	
				652	0	12	4	
				653	0	4	2	
				661	0	16	15	
				713	1	8	0	
				714	0	19	5	
				717	0	19	4	
				743	0	2	8	
				744	0	1	10	
				745	0	13	19	
				746	0	3	0	
				747	0	2	6	
				749	0	3	00	
				750	0	5	0	
				751	0	2	5	
				752	0	1	15	
				753	0	2	8	
				754	0	1	5	
				763	0	0	15	
				764	0	7	11	
				767	0	8	2	
				768	0	1	4	
				769	0	1	4	
				703	0	0	6	
				748	0	0	10	
Total				33	10	6	4	(6. 444) Acre (2) 6096) Hectare

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Gata No.	Area Taken			Remarks
					B.	B.	B.	
Raebareli	Maharaj Ganj	Bachhrawan	Darehita	182	0	0	15	
				183	0	3	0	
				184	0	7	10	
				185	0	8	0	
Total				4	0	19	5	(. 602) Acres (. 2436) Hectare

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Gata No.	Area Taken			Remarks
					B.	B.	B.	
Raebareli	Maharajganj	Bachharawan	Uchauri	457	0	3	0	
				1304	0	2	16	
				1305	1	1	10	
				1306	0	1	7	
				1307	1	2	0	
				Total	5	2	10	(1.583) Acres

(0.6407) Hectares

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Gata No.	Area taken			Remarks
					B.	B.	B.	
Raebareli	Maharajganj	Inhauna	Otia	359M	0	12	0	
				Total	1	0	12	(0.375) Acres

(0.1518) Hectares

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Gata No.	Area Taken			Remarks
					B.	B.	B.	
Raebareli	Maharajganj	Hardoi	Parakalan	6	1	2	14	
				12	0	10	0	
				11	0	7	10	
				18	1	17	15	
				19	0	2	0	
				14	0	0	5	
				13	0	7	0	
				16	0	7	8	
				20	0	8	10	
				Total 9	5	3	2	

(3-222) Acres

(1-3047) Hectares

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Gate No.	Area Taken			Remarks
					B.	B.	B.	
Raebareli	Maharajganj	Semrauta	Majhgaon	535	0	1	0	
				537	0	16	10	
				538/847	0	2	10	
				550	0	6	0	
				552	0	16	10	
				568	0	16	10	
				534/849	0	7	10	
				538	0	6	10	
				551	1	11	0	
				567	0	2	10	
				534	1	19	0	
				569	0	0	10	
				Total 12	7	6	0	(4.562) Acres

(1.8479) Hectares

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Gate No	Area Taken			Remarks
					B	B	B	
Raebareli	Maharaj Ganj	Inhauna	Rampur Pawas	815	0	0	4	
				835	0	7	0	
				836	1	1	0	
				839	0	0	9	
				847	0	6	4	
				848	0	17	0	
				849	0	15	6	
				850	0	13	0	
				861	0	9	16	
				862	1	0	8	
				864	0	1	10	
				874	0	3	18	
				876	0	2	15	
				884	1	4	0	
				885	0	3	3	
				886	0	12	0	
				887	0	4	0	
				888	0	1	5	
				890	0	1	2	
				896	0	5	0	
				823	0	4	5	
				837	1	1	2	
				851	0	1	16	
				853	0	1	12	
				863	0	0	8	
				870	0	1	5	
				875	0	6	0	
				877	0	11	19	
				889	0	11	5	
				903	0	4	5	
Total 30				10	6	17		
(6-464) Acres								
(2-6179) Hectares								

(6-464) Acres
(2-6179) Hectares

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Gate No	Area taken			Remarks
					B	B	B	
1	2	3	4	5	6			7
Raebareli	Maharaj Ganj	Inhauna	Shekhan Gaon	2	0	2	5	
				7	1	18	9	
				9	0	12	0	
				10	0	4	5	
				11	0	6	0	
				19	0	7	0	
				20	1	17	0	
				24	0	15	0	
				25	0	1	10	
				188	0	1	2	
				189	0	2	5	
				49	0	4	10	
				50	0	0	10	
				52	0	0	10	
				197	0	3	0	
				198	1	4	10	
				199	0	0	5	

1	2	3	4	5	6		
				209	0	0	10
				218	0	0	8
				219	0	6	10
				220	0	6	0
				221	0	5	10
				221	2	2	0
				Total 23	11	0	10
							6-266 Acres (2-7905) Hectares

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Gata No.	Area taken			Remarks
					B.	B.	B.	
1	2	3	4	5	6			7
Raebareli	Maharaj Ganj	Inhauna	Panhauna	2691	0	4	0	
				2692	0	10	16	
				2693	0	3	4	
				2694	1	0	4	
				2703	0	3	4	
				2704	0	6	8	
				2705	0	5	0	
				2707	0	2	10	
				2708	0	0	12	
				2715	0	3	18	
				2718	0	6	0	
				2719	0	5	19	
				2720	0	3	4	
				2721	0	10	0	
				2722	0	0	1	
				2723	0	3	12	
				2782	0	14	8	
				2783	0	17	0	
				2787	0	20	0	
				2791	0	4	0	
				2792	0	3	5	
				2793	0	4	0	
				2794	0	13	0	
				2795	0	7	0	
				2799	0	1	15	
				2800	0	6	0	
				2801	0	6	0	
				2802	0	2	5	
				2803	0	0	3	
				2706	0	10	14	
				Total 30	9	0	2	(5-625) Acres (2-2794) Hectares

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Gata No.	Area taken			Remarks
					B.	B.	B.	
1	2	3	4	5	6			7
Raebareli	Maharaj Ganj	Bachhrawan	Sidpur Behta	23	2	5	0	
				24	0	8	0	
				25	0	4	0	
				20	0	3	0	
				35	0	2	0	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
				37	0	9	0
				38	0	18	13
				39	0	18	0
				36	0	9	0
				59	0	5	0
				60	0	9	0
				57	1	9	0
				58	0	12	0
				62	0	2	0
				56	0	3	0
				53	0	1	0
				51	0	4	0
				52	0	8	0
				50	0	2	0
				145	0	3	0
				152	0	0	6
				149	1	15	0
				148	0	8	0
				19	0	5	0
				Total 24	12	2	19
							(7.592) Acres
							(3.0752) Hectares

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Gata No.	Area taken			Remarks
					B.	B.	B.	
Raebareli	Maharaj Ganj	Inhauna	Rajapur	8M	0	5	10	
				9M	0	12	10	
				10M	0	8	5	
				11M	0	0	18	
				12M	0	6	3	
				13M	0	8	5	
				14M	0	0	15	
				18M	0	4	0	
				19M	0	2	15	
				20M	0	5	0	
				21M	0	15	0	
				22M	0	0	2	
				48M	0	14	0	
				Total 13	4	3	3	(2 598) Acres (1 0524) Hectares

INDEX

District	Tahsil	Pargana	Village	Gata No.	Area taken			Remarks
					B.	B.	B.	
1	2	3	4	5	6			7
Raebareli	Maharaj Ganj	Semagrata	Bhiyapur	19	0	9	0	
				20	0	1	10	
				22	0	4	5	
				28	0	10	15	
				29	1	4	0	
				30	0	2	15	
				31	0	3	5	
				33	1	19	0	

38	0	15	0	
39	0	4	15	
40	1	3	15	
41	0	4	0	
46	0	8	0	
49	0	10	10	
52	0	1	0	
76	0	2	10	
77	1	7	0	
Total	17	9	11	0

(5-969) Acres

(2-4075) हेक्टर

[No. O-12016/95/84-ONGD4]

Sd/-

Tahsildar/Asstt. Liaison Officer.

O.N.G.C. Aligarj

Lucknow

नई दिल्ली, 6 अगस्त, 1984

एच.बी.जे. गैस पाइपलाइन प्रोजेक्ट

का०आ०स० 2713—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में हजौरा में बरेली में जगदीशपुर पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये।

ग्राम : मुजवाना, तहसील : रतलाम; जिला : रतलाम; राज्य :
(म.प्र.)

अनुसूची

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लड़ानों का बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्विषय अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अनु. खमरा नं. उपयोग अधिकार अर्जन के लिए अधिग्रहण किया जाने वाला क्षेत्र (हेक्टेयर्स में)

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एवद्वारा घोषित किया है।

1.	284/1	0	080
2.	285/	0	020
3.	286/	0	350
4.	496/	0	090
5.	497/	0	150
6.	501/1	0	050
7.	502/	0	230
8.	503/	0	630
9.	530/	0	500
10.	531/	0	030
11.	532/	0	060
12.	534/	0	150
13.	536/	0	290
14.	537/	0	220
15.	540/1	0	010
16.	540/2	0	430
17.	540/3	0	760
18.	540/4	0	240

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, एच.बी.जे. पाइपलाइन 83 सुभाष नगर मावेर रोड, उज्जैन (म.प्र.)-456001 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टतः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी मुतबाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी का मार्फत।

4-290

[मं. O-12016/91/84-आएनजीडी-4]

New Delhi, the 6th August, 1984

S.O. 2718—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from HAJIRA BARAILY to JAGDI-SHIPUR in M.P. State Pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto:

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein.

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the competent Authority Oil and Natural Gas Commission, HBJ Gas Pipe line, 83, Subash Nagar Sanver Road, Ujjain (M.P.).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

HBJ PIPELINE PROJECT

Village	Sujana	Tehsil	Ratlam	Distt	Ratlam (M.P.)
SCHEDULE					
S. No.	Survey No.	Area to be acquired for R.O.U (in hectares.)			
1.	284/1	0-050			
2.	285/	0-020			
3.	286/	0-350			
4.	496/	0-090			
5.	497/	0-150			
6.	501/1	0-050			
7.	502/	0-230			
8.	503/	2-630			
9.	530/	0-500			
10.	531/	0-030			
11.	532/	0-060			
12.	534/	0-150			
13.	536/	0-290			
14.	537/	0-220			
15.	540/1	0-010			
16.	540/2	0-430			
17.	540/3	0-760			
18.	540/4	0-240			
Total Area		4-250			

[No. O-12016/91/84-ONGD-4]

नई दिल्ली, 7 अगस्त, 1984

का.आ. 2719.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि मध्य प्रदेश राज्य में हजिरा बरैली से जगदीशपुर, पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और अतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्पावद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

वर्तते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, एच.बी.जे. पाइपलाइन 83 सुभाष नगर साँवर रोड, उज्जैन (म.प्र.)-456001 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टतः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी मुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

एच.बी.जे. गैस पाइप लाइन प्रोजेक्ट

ग्राम : गोपालपुर; तहसील : ईसागढ़; जिला : गुना; राज्य : म.प्र.

अनुसूची

अनु. क्र.	खसरा नं.	उपयोग अधिकार अर्जन के लिए अधिग्रहण किया जाने वाला क्षेत्र (हेक्टर में)
1.	162	0 157
2.	57	0 021
3.	161	0 209
4.	139	0 052
5.	37	0 470
6.	38	0 010
7.	35	0 002
8.	39	0 021
9.	41	0 115
10.	36	0 314
11.	42	0 021
12.	47	0 010
13.	45	0 491
14.	17	0 146
15.	55	0 115
16.	15	0 021
17.	14	0 512
18.	13	0 428
19.	61	0 438

नई दिल्ली, 8 अगस्त, 1984

20.	62	0—355
21.	63	0—173
22.	163	0—052
कुल क्षेत्रफल		4—133

[सं. O-12016/92/84-ओएनजी-डो-4]

New Delhi the 7th August, 1984

S.O. 2719.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from HAJIRA BARILLY to JAGDISHPUR in M.P. State pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto:

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein.

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the competent authority Oil and Natural Gas Commission, MBJ gas pipeline 83, Subhash Nagar Sanver Road Ujjain (M.P.).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

MBJ Pipeline Project

Village : Gopalpur Tehsil : Jagarh. Dist. Guna (M.P.)

SCHEDULE

S. No.	Survey No.	Area to be acquired for R.O.U. in hectares
1.	162	0-157
2.	57	0 021
3.	161	0-207
4.	139	0-052
5.	37	0 470
6.	38	0-010
7.	35	0-002
8.	39	0-021
9.	41	0-115
10.	36	0-314
11.	42	0-021
12.	47	0-010
13.	45	0-491
14.	17	0-146
15.	55	0-115
16.	15	0-021
17.	14	0-512
18.	13	0-428
19.	61	0-438
20.	62	0-355
21.	63	0-173
22.	163	0-052
Total Area.		4-133

[No. O-12016/92/84-ONG-D-4]

कां०आ०2720.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में हजीरा से बरेली से जगदीशपुर तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतदपात्र अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है :

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बड़ोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टतः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

हजीरा से बरेली से जगदीशपुर तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए। -

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : बड़ोदरा	तालुका : डमोहे		
1	2	3	4	5
लिगस्थली	966	0	06	06
	591	0	08	00
	592	0	28	60
	593	0	12	13
	594	0	17	50
	599	0	15	20
	598	0	05	70
	600	0	15	40
	601	0	00	30
	552	0	33	50
	550	0	11	20
	553	0	02	00
	549	0	21	60
	547	0	08	00
	548	0	08	80
	545	0	00	40

1	2	3	4	5
लिस्थली-जारी	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	04	00
	492	0	04	30
	499	0	17	00
	500	0	00	50
	503	0	19	20
	497	0	04	80
	504	0	24	80
	505	0	09	10
	507/2	0	17	60
	506/1	0	24	00
	506/2	0	00	80
	385/1	0	18	30
	385/3	0	04	00
	383	0	20	48
	384	0	00	60
	378	0	25	80
	379	0	08	00
	786	0	02	80
	वेस्ट लैण्ड	0	22	40
	45/1/ए	0	04	30
	45/1/बी	0	01	12
	46	0	21	12
	47	0	25	80
	930	0	05	28
	59	0	02	20
	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	09	10
	48	0	01	30
	49	0	16	60
	50	0	29	40
	51	0	18	00
	52	0	28	80
	958	0	08	00

[सं.ओ-12016/87/84-ओएनजी-डी-4]

New Delhi, the 8th August, 1984

S.O. 2720.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from HAJIRA-BAREILLY to JAGDISH-PUR in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user herein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction

and Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vandodara (390009).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Hajira to Bareilly to Jagdishpur

State : Gujarat District : Vadodara Taluka : Dabhoi

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are	Centiare
1	2	3	4	
Lingasthall	966	0	06	06
	591	0	03	00
	592	0	28	60
	593	0	12	13
	594	0	17	50
	599	0	15	20
	598	0	05	70
	600	0	15	40
	601	0	00	30
	552	0	33	50
	550	0	11	20
	553	0	2	00
	549	0	21	60
	547	0	03	00
	548	0	08	80
	545	0	00	40
	Cart track	0	04	00
	492	0	04	70
	499	0	17	00
	500	0	00	50
	503	0	19	20
	497	0	04	80
	504	0	24	80
	505	0	09	10
	507/2	0	17	60
	506/1	0	24	00
	506/2	0	00	80
	385/1	0	18	30
	385/3	0	04	00
	383	0	20	48
	384	0	00	60
	378	0	25	80
	379	0	08	00
	786	0	02	80
	Waste land	0	22	40
	45/1/A	0	04	30
	45/1/B	0	01	12
	46	0	21	12
	47	0	25	80
	930	0	05	28
	59	0	02	20
	Cart track	0	00	10
	48	0	01	30
	49	0	16	60
	50	0	29	40
	51	0	18	00
	52	0	28	80
	958	0	08	00

[No. O-12016/87/84-ONG-D4]

का०आ० 2721.—यतः कन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में एन.के. 29 (एन.के.पी.) से एन.के.डी. झंडतक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बड़ोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी मुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

एन.के. 29 (एन.के.पी.) से एन.के.डी. झंड

राज्य : गुजरात जिला : अहमदाबाद तालुका : विरमगाम

गाँव	सं०	हेक्टेयर	एअरई	सेन्टीयर
बालसरण	157/1	0	01	44
	158/1	0	09	84
	154/3	0	02	64
	154/2	0	03	72
	154/1/2	0	04	44
	154/1/1	0	04	44
	133/2	0	05	64
	152	0	00	72

[सं० ओ-12016/83/84-ओ एन जी-डी-4]

S.O. 2721.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from N.K.-29 (NKP) to NKDZ in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land)

Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division Makarpura Road Vadodara (390009).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from NK-29 (NKP) to NKDZ

State : Gujarat District : Ahmedabad Taluka : Viramgam

Village	Survey No.	Hec- tare	Acre	Cent- tial
Balsaran	157/1	0	01	44
	158/1	0	09	84
	154/3	0	02	64
	154/2	0	03	72
	154/1/2	0	01	44
	154/1/1	0	04	44
	153/2	0	05	64
	152	0	00	72

[No. O-12016/83/84-ONG-D-4]

नई दिल्ली, 10 अगस्त, 1984

का०आ० 2722 यतः केंद्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में जोड़ाना जी जी.एस. से सोमासन सी.टी.एम. तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्वद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बड़ोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी मुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची				
जोडाना जी०जी०एम० मे सोभासन सी०टी०एफ० तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए				
राज्य : गुजरात जिला एवं तालुका : मेहसाना				
गांव	कोकन	हेक्टर	ग्राम	सेन्टीयर
1	2	3	4	5
खोंच	1374	0	03	55
	1376	0	06	70
	1377	0	08	70
	1381	0	01	90
	1380	0	04	35
कार्ट ट्रैक		0	00	25
	1314	0	00	35
	1342	0	03	30
	1313	0	05	50
	1331/1	0	02	25
	1334/2	0	05	45
	1333	0	07	70
	1332	0	02	50
कार्ट ट्रैक		0	01	50
	1303	0	04	00
	1304	0	05	80
	1307	0	07	00
	1306	0	04	00
	1312	0	06	80
	1234	0	03	45
	1235	0	01	75
	1206	0	06	00
	1207	0	04	50
	1208	0	04	25
	1203	0	04	50
	1202	0	05	75
	1008	0	10	00
	1032	0	01	75
	1031	0	04	25
कार्ट ट्रैक		0	00	25
	1011	0	05	80
	1013	0	08	55
	1014	0	02	60
कार्ट ट्रैक		0	00	30
	964	0	01	41
	963	0	04	15
	959	0	01	15
	962	0	02	65
	961	0	07	00
	960 ए		01	25

1	2	3	4	5
	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	25
	938	0	06	50
	939	0	01	25
	941	0	04	30
	942	0	06	40
	943	0	02	00
	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	20
	914	0	08	05
	893	0	06	50
	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	25
	883	0	03	85
	882	0	02	30
	881	0	02	25
	880	0	01	40
	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	25
	879	0	02	45
	878	0	00	60
	877	0	04	50
	866	0	01	70
	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	30
	832	0	04	10
	833	0	02	05
	834	0	10	40
	711	0	04	25
	835	0	01	75

[म. ओ-12016/86/84-ओ एन जी-डी-4]

पी०के० राजगोपालन, डेस्क अधिकारी

S.O. 2722.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Jotana Gas to Sobhasan CTP Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission:

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land of the Competent Authority, Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara (390009).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

pipeline from Jotana GGS to Sobhasan CTF.

State : Gujarat District & Taluka : Mehsana

Village	Block No.	Hec- tare	Are	Centi- tare
1	2	3	4	5
Linch	1374	0	03	55
	1376	0	06	70
	1377	0	08	70
	1381	0	01	90
	1380	0	04	35
	Cart track	0	00	25
	1344	0	00	35
	1342	0	03	30
	1343	0	05	50
	1334/1	0	02	25
	1334/2	0	05	45
	1333	0	07	70
	1332	0	02	50
	Cart track	0	01	50
	1303	0	04	00
	1304	0	05	80
	1307	0	07	00
	1306	0	04	00
	1312	0	06	80
	1234	0	03	45
	1235	0	01	75
	1206	0	06	00
	1207	0	04	50
	1208	0	04	25
	1203	0	04	50
	1202	0	06	75
	1008	0	10	00
	1032	0	01	75
	1031	0	04	25
	Cart track	0	00	25
	1011	0	05	80
	1013	0	08	55
	1014	0	02	60
	Cart track	0	00	30
	964	0	01	40
	963	0	04	15
	959	0	01	15
	962	0	02	65
	961	0	07	00
	960/A	0	01	25
	Cart track	0	00	25
	938	0	06	50
	939	0	01	25
	941	0	01	30
	942	0	06	40
	943	0	02	00
	Cart track	0	00	20
	914	0	08	05
	893	0	06	50
	Cart track	0	00	25
	883	0	03	85
	882	0	02	30
	881	0	02	25
	880	0	01	40
	Cart track	0	00	25
	879	0	02	45
	878	0	00	60
	877	0	04	50
	866	0	01	70
	Cart track	0	00	30
	832	0	04	10
	833	0	02	05
	834	0	10	40
	711	0	04	25
	835	0	01	75

(कोयला विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 8 अगस्त, 1984

का० प्रा० 2723:—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कोयला खान भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 46) की धारा 3क की अपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, और भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिमूचना सं० का०प्रा० 2151, तारीख 10 जुलाई, 1978 का अधिकांश करने हुए, तारीख 8-8-1984 से एक न्यायी बोर्ड गठित करती है जिसमें निम्नलिखित व्यक्ति होंगे, अर्थात्:—

1. सचिव भारत सरकार अध्यक्ष
कोयला विभाग, नई दिल्ली।
3. कोयला खान भविष्य निधि पदेन सदस्य
आयुक्त, धनबाद।
सदस्य
3. कोयला सचिव, भारत सरकार
(कोयला खान भविष्य निधि का
भार-साधक)
कोयला विभाग नई दिल्ली।

भारत सरकार के प्रति-
निधि

4. निदेशक उप सचिव,
(कंपनी कार्य का भारसाधक),
कोयला विभाग, नई दिल्ली।
5. केन्द्रीय भविष्य निधि आयुक्त,
नई दिल्ली।
6. श्रम आयुक्त, बिहार सरकार, पटना।
7. संयुक्त सचिव, श्रम विभाग,
पश्चिमी बंगाल सरकार, राज्यों सरकारों के प्रति-
कलकत्ता। निधि
8. श्रम आयुक्त, मध्य प्रदेश, इन्दौर „
9. श्रम आयुक्त, आंध्र प्रदेश सरकार, „
हैदराबाद।
10. उप श्रम आयुक्त महाराष्ट्र „
सरकार, लिबर्टी सिनेमा
बिल्डिंग, नागपुर।
11. आयुक्त एवं सचिव, „
श्रम और रोजगार विभाग,
उड़ीसा सरकार, भुवनेश्वर।
12. श्री जी. आर. भंडारी, नियोजकों के प्रतिनिधि
महा-प्रबंधक (ई ई),
कोल इंडिया लि.,
10. नेताजी सुभाष रोड,
कलकत्ता।
13. श्री विष्णु मनोहर,
निदेशक (कामिक), भारत कोकिंग
कोल लि., कोयला भवन,
धनबाद।
14. श्री सी० साहा निदेशक (वित्त),
ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लि.,
ठाकुर दिनेश्वर, संकटोरिया,
जिला बर्दवान।

15. श्री यू. के. जीवे, निदेशक (कार्मिक'),
संयुक्त कोलफील्ड्स लि.,
दरभंगा हाउस, रांची।

16. श्री आर. ए. पी. सिंह, नियोजकों के
निदेशक (कार्मिक), प्रतिनिधि
वेस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लि., नागपुर।

17. श्री डी. पी. पराजपे, महाप्रबंधक,
सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कंपनी लि.,
डाकघर कोठागुदम कोलियरीज,
जिला खामान, आन्ध्र प्रदेश

18. श्री एस. दासगुप्ता, महासचिव,
भारतीय राष्ट्रीय खान कर्मचार
फेडरेशन, राजेन्द्र पथ, धनबाद।

19. श्री एन. पी. राय, संयुक्त महासचिव, कर्मचारियों के
राष्ट्रीय कोलियरी मजदूर मंत्र मा इकल प्रतिनिधि
जोन स्मृति भवन, राजेन्द्र पथ, धनबाद।

20. श्री मोहन शा, सचिव,
संयुक्त खदान मजदूर संघ,
डाकघर उमरेर कोलियरी,
जिला नागपुर।

21. श्री बनारसी सिंह ग्राजाद
महा सचिव, खान श्रमिक कांग्रेस,
सिनेमा मार्ग, डाकघर उखरा,
जिला बर्दवान पश्चिमी बंगाल।

22. श्री एम. एल. ब्रूमर (महाप्रबंधक,
भारत कोकिंग कोल लि.,)
भारतीय खान प्रबंधक एसोसिएशन,
आई. एम. एम. प. भवन, डाकघर
सरायहेला, धनबाद।

23. श्री एम. कासिम, महासचिव,
भारतीय कोयला खान अधिकारी
एसोसिएशन, डाकघर, उखरा,
जिला बर्दवान, पश्चिमी बंगाल।

[सं. 7(3)/80-प्रशा.-1 (अ. नि.)]

समय सिंह, अवर सचिव

(Department of Coal)

New Delhi, the 8th August, 1984

S.O. 2723.—In exercise of the powers conferred by subsection (1) of section 3A of the Coal Mines Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1948 (46 of 1948) and in pursuance of the notification of the Government of India in the later Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 2151 dated the 10th July, 1978, the Central Government hereby constitutes with effect from the 8th August, 1984, a Board of Trustees consisting of the following persons, namely:—

- Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Coal, New Delhi —Chairman
- The Coal Mines Provident Fund Commissioner, Dhanbad, Ex-Officio Member

MEMBERS

- Joint Secretary to the Government of India, (Incharge Coal Mines Provident Fund of India Department of Coal, New Delhi) Representatives of the Government
- Director/Deputy Secretary, (Incharge Company Affairs Work), Department of Coal, New Delhi. "
- The Central Provident Fund Commissioner, New Delhi. "
- The Commissioner of Labour, Government of Bihar, Patna. Representatives of State Governments
- Joint Secretary Labour Department, Government of West Bengal, Calcutta. "
- Labour Commissioner, Madhya Pradesh, Indore. "
- The Commissioner of Labour, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad. "
- Deputy Commissioner of Labour, Government of Maharashtra, Liberty Cinema Building, Nagpur. "
- The Commissioner-cum-Secretary, Labour and Employment Department Government of Orissa, Bhudbaneshwar. "
- Shri G.R. Bhandari, General Manager (EE), Coal India Limited, 10, Netaji Subhash Road, Calcutta. Employers' Representatives
- Shri Vishnu Manohar, Director (Personnel) Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Koyla Bhavan, Dhanbad. "
- Shri C.Saha, Director (Finance), Eastern Coalfields Limited P.O. Dishergarh, Sanctoria District Burdwan. "
- Shri U.K. Choubey, Director (Personnel), Central coalfields Limited, Darbhanga House, Ranchi. "
- Shri R.A.P. Singh, Director (Personnel), Western Coalfields Limited, Nagpur. "
- Shri D.V. Paranjpe, General Manager, Singareni Collieries Company Limited, P.O. Kothagudem Collieries, District Khamam, Andhra Pradesh. "
- Shri S. Das Gupta, General Secretary, Indian National Mineworkers Federation, Rajindra Path, Dhanbad Employees Representative
- Shri S.P. Roy, Joint General Secretary, Rashtriya Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Michael John Smriti Bhavan, Rajendra Path, Dhanbad. "

20. Shri Mohan Jha,
Secretary,
Samyukta Khudan Mazdoor Sangh,
P.O. Umrer Colliery,
District Nagpur.

21. Shri Banarasi Singh Azad
General Secretary,
Khan Shramik Congress,
Cinema Road, P.O. Ukhra,
District Burdwan, West Bengal.

22. Shri M.L. Dugai
(General Manager, Bharat Cooking
Coal Limited),
Indian Mine Managers' Association,
IMMA Bhawan,
P.O. Saraidhela, District Dhanbad

23. Shri M. Qasem,
General Secretary
Coal Mines Officers' Association
of India,
P.O. Ukhra, District Burdwan,
West Bengal.

[No. 7(3)/80 Adm I (PF)]
SA MAY SINGH, Under Secy.

स्वास्थ्य और कल्याण मंत्रालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 4 अगस्त, 1984

का० [आ० 2724.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार भारत सरकार के स्वास्थ्य मंत्रालय की 7 जुलाई, 1984 की अधिसूचना सं० बी० 11016/3/84 एम०ई० (पी०) द्वारा यह निर्देश दिया है कि कराची विश्वविद्यालय (पाकिस्तान) द्वारा प्रदत्त चिकित्सा अर्हता एम० बी० बी० एम० भारतीय चिकित्सा परिषद् अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102वाँ) के प्रयोजन के लिए मान्यताप्राप्त चिकित्सा अर्हता होगी;

और यतः डा० (श्रीमती) तबस्सुम अमीर वली (विवाह-पूर्व तबस्सुम आरा अब्बासी) जो उक्त अर्हता रखती हैं फिलहाल मटह सेवा संघ, नागपुर के साथ धर्मार्थ कार्य के लिये संबद्ध हैं;

अतः अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 14 की उपधारा (1) के परन्तुक के खंड (ग) के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय की 20 जुलाई 1984 की अधिसूचना सं० बी० 11016/3/84-एम०ई० (पी०) का अधिक्रमण करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित विनियमित करती है:—

- (i) 9 फरवरी, 1985 तक की अवधि
- (ii) वह अवधि जिसमें डा० (श्रीमती) तबस्सुम उक्त मटह सेवा संघ, नागपुर के साथ संबद्ध रहेंगी, जो भी कम हो, उक्त डाक्टर द्वारा चिकित्सीय प्रैक्टिस करने की सीमित अवधि होगी।

[संख्या बी० 11016/3/84-एम०ई० (पी०)]
रविन्द्रनाथ तिवारी, उप-सचिव

MINISTRY OF HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE

ORDER

New Delhi the 4th August, 1984

S.O. 2724.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Health No. V. 11016/3/84-MF (P) dated the 7th July, 1984, the Central Government has directed that the medical qualification M.B.B.S. granted by the University of Karachi (Pakistan) shall be recognised medical qualification for the purpose of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956) ;

And Whereas Dr. (Mrs.) Tabassum Amir Vali, (Nee Tabassum Ara Abbasi) who possesses the said qualification is for the time being attached to the Matru Sewa Sangh, Nagpur, for the purpose of charitable work ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of clause (c) of the proviso to sub-section (1) of section 14 of the said "Act and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare No. V. 11016/3/84-MF (P), dated the 20th July, 1984, the Central Government hereby specifies—

- (i) a period up to the 9th February 1985, or
- (ii) the period during which Dr. (Mrs.) Tabassum Amir Vali (nee Tabassum Ara Abbasi) is attached to the said Matru Sewa Sangh, Nagpur, whichever is shorter, as the period to which the medical practice by the aforesaid doctor shall be limited.

[No. V. 11016/3/84-MF(P)]
R. N. TFWARI, Dy. Secy.

निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय

(दिल्ली प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 9 अगस्त, 1984

का. आ. 2725.—दिल्ली विकास अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 61वाँ) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (3) के खण्ड (च) के साथ पठित उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय की 6-5-83 की अधिसूचना संख्या के-11011/22/78-सी डी 1 (ए) के अतिरिक्त में केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय के संयुक्त सचिव श्री आर. एल. प्रदीप को श्री एल. एम. मैनेजीज के स्थान पर दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण के एक सदस्य के रूप में नामित करती है तथा भारत सरकार के स्वास्थ्य मंत्रालय की दिनांक 30 दिसम्बर, 1957 की अधिसूचना सं. 12-173/57-एल. एम. जी. में आगे और निम्नलिखित मंजूर करती है, नामतः:—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, मद सं. 9 में, "श्री एल. एम. मैनेजीज" के स्थान पर "श्री आर. एल. प्रदीप" लिखा जाए।

[सं. के.-11011/22/78-सी. डी. आर्क. ए./IIवीं]
चन्द्र सैन, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF WORKS & HOUSING (Delhi Division)

New Delhi, the 9th August, 1984

S.O. 2725.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1), read with clause (g) of sub-section (3) of section 3 of the Delhi Development Act, 1957 (61 of 1957)

and in supersession of the Ministry of Works and Housing Notification No. K. 11011/22/78-DDI(A) dated the 6-5-83, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri R. L. Pardeep, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Works and Housing as a Member of the Delhi Development Authority in place of Shri L. M. Menzes, and makes the following further amendment in the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Health No. 12-173/57 ISG dated the 30th December, 1957, namely :—

In the said Notification, in item 9, for the entry "Shri L. M. Menzes" the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—"Shri R. L. Pardeep".

[No. K-11011/22/78/DDIA/IB]
CHANDRA SAIN, Dy. Secy.

नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय

(परिवहन पक्ष)

नई दिल्ली, 3 अगस्त, 1984

कां. आ. 2726 -- केन्द्रीय सरकार, डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) नियम, 1962 के नियम 4 के उप-नियम (i) के दूसरे परन्तु के साथ पठित डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 5क की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, कैप्टन आर. नथ को, श्री एम. के. सन्याल के स्थान पर, जिन्होंने त्याग-पत्र दे दिया है, कलकत्ता डाक श्रमवाड़ का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है और भारत सरकार के नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय (परिवहन पक्ष) की अधिसूचना सं. का. आ. 696 (अ) तारीख 30 सितम्बर, 1982 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में, "डाक कर्मकार और नौवहन कर्तव्यों के नियोजन का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले सदस्य" शीर्षक के नीचे मद सं. 4 के समेत, "श्री एम. के. सन्याल" प्रकाष्ट के स्थान पर "कैप्टन आर. नथ" प्रकाष्ट रखी जायेगी।

[फा. सं. एल. डी. सी./6/82-यू.एस. (एल०)]

MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT
(Transport Wing)

New Delhi, the 3rd August, 1984

S.O. 2726.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 5A of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), read with the second proviso to sub-rule (i) of rule 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Rules 1962, the Central Government hereby appoints Capt. R. Nath, as a member of the Calcutta Dock Labour Board vice Shri S. K. Sanyal who has resigned and makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Transport Wing), No. S. O. 696(E) dated the 30th September, 1982, as follows :—

In the said notification, under heading "Members representing the employers of Dock Workers and Shipping Companies," against item No. 4 for the entry "Shri S. K. Sanyal" the entry "Capt. R. Nath" shall be substituted.

[F. No. LDC/6/82-US(L)]

NOTE—The principal notification was published vide S.O. No. 696(E) dated the 30th September, 1982, This was subsequently amended vide notification mentioned below.

S.O. No. 2382 dated the 12th May, 1983

कां. आ. 2727 -- श्री एम. के. सन्याल ने, जिस भारत सरकार के नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय, (परिवहन पक्ष) की अधिसूचना सं. का. आ. 2382 तारीख 12 मई, 1983 द्वारा कलकत्ता डाक श्रमवाड़ का सदस्य नियुक्त किया गया था, डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) नियम, 1962 के नियम 4 के उपनियम (3) के अधीन त्याग-पत्र दे दिया है;

और उक्त सदस्य के त्याग-पत्र दे देने से उक्त डाक श्रमवाड़ में एक रिक्ति हो गई है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त नियमों के नियम 4 के उप-नियम (5) के अनुसरण में उक्त रिक्ति को अधिसूचित करती है।

[फा. सं. एल. डी. सी./6/82-यू.एस. (एल०)]

S.O. 2727.—Whereas Shri S. K. Sanyal, who was appointed as a member of the Calcutta Dock Labour Board by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Transport Wing) No. S.O. 2382 dated the 12th May, 1983, has resigned under sub-rule (3) of rule 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Rules, 1982;

And whereas a vacancy has occurred in the said Dock Labour Board by the resignation of the said member;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-rule (5) of rule 4 of the said rules, the Central Government hereby notifies the said vacancy.

[F. No. LDC/6/82-US(L)]

नई दिल्ली, 4 अगस्त, 1984

कां.आ. 2728 श्री एम०डी० कूपर को, भारत सरकार के नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय, (परिवहन पक्ष) की अधिसूचना कां.आ. सं. 650(अ), तारीख 2 सितम्बर, 1982 द्वारा, जो कि भारत के राजपत्र, (असाधारण) भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 6 सितम्बर, 1982 में प्रकाशित हुई थी, मुम्बई स्टिवर्ड्स एसोसिएशन के एक प्रतिनिधि के रूप में डाक कर्मकार सलाहकार समिति का सदस्य नियुक्त किया गया था।

2 और मुम्बई स्टिवर्ड्स एसोसिएशन ने श्री एम० डी० कूपर के स्थान पर श्री जे०सी० नानावती को डाक कर्मकार सलाहकार समिति के सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्ति के लिये नामनिर्देशित किया है और इस प्रकार डाक कर्मकार (सलाहकार समिति) नियम, 1962 के नियम 6 के उप-

नियम 5(ड) के निबन्धनों के अनुसार उक्त डाक कर्मकार सलाहकार समिति में सदस्य का एक पद रिक्त हो गया है।

3. अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, डाक कर्मकार (सलाहकार समिति) नियम, 1962 के नियम 6 के उपनियम (1) के दूसरे परल्लुके के साथ पठित डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री जी०सी० नानावती को, श्री एम०डी० कूपर के स्थान पर, डाक कर्मकार सलाहकार समिति का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है और भारत सरकार के नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय (परिवहन पक्ष), की अधिसूचना कां०आ० सं० 650(ड) तारीख 2 सितम्बर, 1982 में, जो कि भारत के राजपत्र (असाधारण) भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 6 सितम्बर, 1982 में प्रकाशित की गई थी, निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना में “डाक कर्मकारों और नौवहन कंपनियों के नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले सदस्य” शीर्षक के नीचे मद 1 में “श्री एम०डी० कूपर” के नाम के स्थान पर “श्री जी०सी० नानावती” का नाम रखा जायगा।

[का० सं० एल०डी०ओ०/44/82-यू एस (एल) जि-II]

सुदेश कुमार, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 4th August, 1984

S.O. 2728.—Whereas Shri M. D. Cooper was appointed as a member of the Dock Workers Advisory Committee as a

representative of the Bombay Stevedores' Association vide Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Transport Wing) S.O.No. 650 (E) dated the 2nd September, 1982 published in the Gazette of India (Extra-ordinary) part II, Section 3, Sub section (ii) dated the 6th September, 1982;

2. Whereas the Bombay Stevedores' Association has since nominated Shri J. C. Nanavati for appointment as a member of Dock Workers Advisory Committee in place of Shri M.D.Cooper and thus a vacancy has occurred in the said Dock Workers Advisory Committee in terms of sub-rule (5) (e) of rule 6 of the Dock Workers (Advisory Committee) Rules, 1962;

3. Now, therefore in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 5 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948) read with the second proviso to sub-rule (1) of rule 6 of the Dock Workers (Advisory Committee) Rules 1962, the Central Government thereby appoints Shri J.C.Nanavati as a member of the Dock Workers Advisory Committee vice Shri M. D. Cooper and makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Transport Wing) S.O.No.650 (E) dated the 2nd September, 1982 published in the Gazette of India (Extra-ordinary), part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated the 6th September, 1982, namely:—

In the said Notification, under the heading “Members representing the Employers of Dock Workers and Shipping Companies” in item name “Shri M. D. Cooper” the name “Shri J. C. Nanavati” shall be substituted.

[F. No. LDO/44/82-US(L) (Vol. II)]

SUDESH KUMAR Under Secy.

Note : The principal notification was published vide S.O. No. 650(E) dated the 6th September, 1982. This was subsequently amended vide notifications mentioned below :—

S.O. No. 721 (E) dated the 8th October, 1982

S.O. No. 849(E) dated the 15th December, 1982

S.O. No. 4380 dated the 3rd December, 1983.

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 28 जुलाई, 1984

कां०आ० 2729.—भारत सरकार के सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय के आदेश संख्या 3792, दिनांक 2 दिसम्बर, 1966 की प्रथम अनुसूची में निर्दिष्ट प्रत्येक अधिनियम के उपबन्ध के अन्तर्गत जारी किये गये निर्देशों के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, फिल्म सलाहकार बोर्ड, बम्बई की सिफारिशों पर विचार करने के बाद एतद्वारा इसके साथ लगी अनुसूची के कालम 2 में दी गई फिल्मों को, उनके सभी भारतीय भाषाओं के रूपांतरों सहित, जिनका विवरण प्रत्येक के सामने उक्त अनुसूची के कालम 6 में दिया हुआ है, स्वीकृत करती है :—

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	फिल्म का नाम	फिल्म की संख्या	आवेदक का नाम	निर्माता का नाम	क्या वैज्ञानिक फिल्म है या शिक्षा संबंधी फिल्म है या समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म है या डाकुमेंटरी फिल्म है ?
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	महिती चित्र 396	295.66	सूचना सहायक निदेशक (एफ), गुजरात सरकार. रामनाथ रिसर्च लेबोरेटरी, 77, डा० एनी बेमेंट रोड. वर्ली, बम्बई-18		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। गुजरात सकिट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।

1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	सर्विसेस आफ ट्रीज	289.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, भारत सरकार, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		डाकुमेंटरी फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
3.	इन सर्व्स आफ फिश	475.00	--तथैव--		--तथैव--
4.	नॉनशलाइड मुवमेन्ट : बेलग्रेड टु दिल्ली।	591.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, भारत सरकार, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		डाकुमेंटरी फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
5.	राधा शोज वी वे	63.00	--तथैव--		--तथैव--
6.	एक्यूज आफ नरकोटिक ड्रग्स	395.00	--तथैव--		--तथैव--
7.	सुखों के साथी	270.00	मैरुस दुर्गा खोटे प्रोडक्शंस, इंडिया हाउस, प्रथम तल, बालचंद हीराचंद मार्ग, बम्बई-400001		--तथैव--
8.	एक ही उपाय	432.00	--तथैव--		--तथैव--
9.	सतफलया करीता	571.87	श्री विजय एस० पै, नं० 6, विष्णु कुंज, ब्राह्मबाबा रोड, मंटूंगा, बम्बई-19		डाकुमेंटरी फिल्म। ग्रामीण और गहरी क्षेत्रों में प्रदर्शन के लिये।
10.	इंटीग्रेटेड एनर्जी प्रोग्राम	252.00	सूचना और जनसपर्क महा- निदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार, फिल्म सेंटर, 68, तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-34		डाकुमेंटरी फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
11.	महिति चित्र संख्या 397	289.56	सूचना सहायक, निदेशक, (एफ), गुजरात सरकार, रामनाथ रिस्सर्व लिब्रेररी, बर्ली, बम्बई-400028	निदेशक, प्रशासन, गुजरात सरकार, सचिवालय, ब्लॉक-7, गांधीनगर-382010	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।
12.	हिमालयन इंडीवर	597.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, भारत सरकार, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-400026		डाकुमेंटरी फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
13.	स्टेपिंग फारवर्ड	299.92	गोवर्धन अधिकारी, प्रोडक्शंस, 12, श्रीधर राय रोड, कल- कत्ता-39		डाकुमेंटरी फिल्म। पश्चिम बंगाल में प्रदर्शन के लिये।
14.	एनर्जी इन इंडियाज डेवेलपमेंट	597.41	फालि बिल्लीमोरिया प्रोडक्शंस, फिल्म सेंटर, 68, तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-400034		डाकुमेंटरी फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
15.	वार्ता तरंगिनी संख्या 43	309.00	आंध्र प्रदेश राज्य फिल्म विकास निगम लि०, 11-5- 423/1, जफरबाग, लकड़ी का पुल, हैदराबाद-500004		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। आंध्र- प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।
16.	वार्ता तरंगिनी संख्या 44	285.00	आंध्र प्रदेश राज्य फिल्म विकास निगम लिमिटेड, 11-5-423/1, जफरबाग, लकड़ी का पुल, हैदराबाद- 500004		--तथैव--
17.	महबूब नगर जिला	306.05	वेंकट वाराणसी, 5 बसत बिहार, छठी रोड, जैम्वूर, बम्बई-400071		डाकुमेंटरी फिल्म। आंध्र प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।

1	2	3	4	5	6
18.	कुमायूनीज आन कामेट	304 00	फिल्म प्रभाग, भारत सरकार, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई- 100026		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये ।
19.	महाराष्ट्र न्यूज सख्या 391	287 00	सूचना और जनसंपर्क मंत्रालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार, फिल्म सेक्टर, 68- नरदेव रोड, बम्बई-400034.		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म । महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
20.	ए. गोल्डन गेटवे	297 18	जे.एस. वट्टेकर, एम-17, अम्बेडकर नगर, पुरेल, बम्बई-12		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
21.	स्त्री	502 92	कै. अमन जी, म. फ. नं. कै. राज. ब. दू., मारनोपुरम, विजयवाड़ा ।		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । आंध्र प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
22.	उत्तर प्रदेश समाचार-108	288. 65	निदेशक, सूचना और जनसंपर्क, उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार, लखनऊ ।		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म । केवल उत्तर प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये ।
23.	महिति चित्र सख्या 398	298 70	सहायक निदेशक, सूचना गुजरात सरकार, रामनाई रिसर्च लेबोरेटरी, 77, डा. ऐनी बेसेट रोड, बर्ली, बम्बई-18		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म । गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये ।
24.	बचत ग्राम	365 76	मैसर्स बी.एस. इंटरप्राइजेज 11, रामश्याम निवास, शीतला देवी, मन्दिर मार्ग, माहिम बम्बई-16.		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये ।
25.	फ्रैंड्स एक्सास दि सो	360 00	फिल्म प्रभाग, भारत सरकार 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26.		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
26.	नवजीवन	70 00	-तदैव-		-तदैव-
27.	बेट दि फेयर	103 00	-तदैव-		-तदैव-
28.	टेमिंग आफ दि रिबर माही	307 00	-तदैव-		-तदैव-
29.	हम सब भारतीय हैं ।	169 00	प्रेम प्रकाश फोटोग्राफिक कार्यालय, सशस्त्र सेना फिल्म और फोटो प्रभाग, रक्षा मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली ।	कै.एस. कुलकर्णी सशस्त्र सेना फिल्म और फोटो प्रभाग, रक्षा मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली ।	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
30.	वार्ता तरंगिनी सख्या 45	302 00	आंध्र प्रदेश राज्य फिल्म विकास निगम लिमिटेड, 11-5-423/1, जफरबाग, लकडी का पुल, हैदराबाद- 500004		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म । आंध्र प्रदेश में सर्किट प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
31.	गुजरात इंडस्ट्रीज आन दि मार्च	599 85	सहायक सूचना निदेशक (एफ), गुजरात सरकार रामनाई रिसर्च लेबोरेटरी, 77-डा. ऐनी बेसेट रोड, बर्ली, बम्बई-400018,	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, सचिवालय, ब्लॉक 7, गांधीनगर-382010	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए ।

1	2	3	4	5	6
32	सुप्रभाष भारती	268 83	निदेशक, सूचना और जनसम्पर्क, उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार, लखनऊ।		डाकूमेंट्री फिल्म। उत्तर प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
33	महिला चित्र संख्या 399	318 52	सहायक सूचना निदेशक (एफ), गुजरात सरकार, रामनाई रिसर्च लेबोरेटरी, 77, डा० एनी बेसेट रोड बम्बई-400018	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सर- कार, सचिवालय ब्लाक-7, गांधी नगर-382010	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।
34	बिहार समाचार चित्र सं० 20	266 70	एम० झा, फिल्म माहिर, बिहार सरकार, पटना।	सूचना और जनसम्पर्क निदेशक बिहार सरकार, पटना।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। बिहार सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।
35.	बिहार समाचार चित्र संख्या 21	268 22	—तथैव—	—तथैव—	—तथैव—
36	बिहार समाचार चित्र संख्या 22	284. 99	—तथैव—	—तथैव—	—तथैव—
37	बिहार समाचार चित्र संख्या 23	270 66	—तथैव—	—तथैव—	—तथैव—
38	तन्त्राकुवा सम्ना	331 61	दुर्गा खोटे प्राइक्ट्स, मल्होत्रा, हाउस, प्रथम तल, प्रधान डाकघर के सामने, बालचन्द होराचंद मार्ग, बम्बई-1		डाकूमेंट्री फिल्म। महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।
39.	लोक अदालत	396 24	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, रामनाई रिसर्च लेबोरेटरी, 77, डा० एनी बेसेट रोड, बर्ली बम्बई-18	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सर- कार, सचिवालय, ब्लाक-7, गांधी नगर-382010	डाकूमेंट्री फिल्म। गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।
40.	मिनरल एक्स प्लोटेसन	348. 00	फिल्मप्रभाग, भारत सरकार, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-400026		डाकूमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
41.	एक्सप्लोरिंग दि थर्ड पोल	341. 37	—तथैव—		—तथैव—
42.	मध्य प्रदेश समाचार दर्शन 46	275 84	आनंदहुटवाले, मार्फत सूचना और प्रचार निदेशक, मध्य प्रदेश सरकार, भोपाल।	सूचना और प्रचार निदेशक, मध्य प्रदेश सरकार, भोपाल।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। मध्य प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।
43.	महिति चित्र संख्या 400	288 04	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुज- रात सरकार, रामनाई रिसर्च लेबोरेटरी, नि०, बर्ली बम्बई-1	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सर- कार सचिवालय, ब्लाक-7, गांधीनगर-382010	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।
44.	महाराष्ट्र समाचार चित्र संख्या 392	276. 00	सूचना और जनसम्पर्क महा- निदेशालय, राष्ट्र सरकार, फिल्म सेटर, 68, तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-400034		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।
45	गुजरात स्टेडियम	278 89	सहायक सूचना निदेशक (एफ), गुजरात सरकार, रामनाई रिसर्च लेबोरेटरी नि०, 77, डा० एनी बेसेट रोड, बम्बई-18	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार सचिवालय, ब्लाक-7 गांधीनगर-382010	डाकूमेंट्री फिल्म। गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।

1	2	3	4	5	6
46. माई एक्सपिरियन्स	39.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, भारत सरकार, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई- 400026			डाकूमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये ।
47. नन्हें मुझे बच्चे	557.00	—तथैव—			डाकूमेंट्री फिल्म । ग्रामीण तथा अर्धशहरी क्षेत्रों में प्रदर्शन के लिये ।

[फाइल संख्या 315/3/83-एफ(पी)]

सुकुमार मंडल, डेप्टी सचिव

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

ORDER

New Delhi, the 28th July, 1984

S.O. 2729.—In pursuance of the directions issued under the provision of each of the elements specified in the First Schedule to the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting No. S.O. 3792 dated 2nd December, 1966 the Central Government after considering recommendations of the Film Advisory Board, Bombay hereby approves the films specified in column 2 of the Schedule annexed hereto in all its/their language versions to be of the description specified against it/each in column 6 of the said schedule.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Title of the film	Length of the film in metres	Name of the Applicant	Name of the producer	Brief synopsis whether a scientific film or for educational purpose or a film dealing with news & current events or documentary film.
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Mahitichitra-396	295.66	Asstt. Director of Information (F), Govt of Gujarat, Ramnord Research Laboratory, 77, Dr Annie Besant Road, Worli, Bombay 18		'News and Current Events' Gujarat circuit only
2	Services of Trees	289.00	Films Division, Govt. of India, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay 26		'Documentary' General Release
3	In Search of Fish	475.00	Films Division, Govt of India, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay 26		do
4	Non-Aligned Movement : Belgrade to Delhi	591.00	do		do
5	Rudha shows the Way	63.00	do		-do-
6	Abuse of Narcotic Drugs.	395.00	-do-		-do-
7.	Sukhon Ke Sathi	270.00	M/s. Durga Khote Prod., India House, 1st floor, Walchand Hirachand Marg, Bombay-40,0001.		'Documentary' General Release.
8.	Ek Hi Upay	432.00	-do-		-do-
9.	Satfalaya Karita	571.87	Mr. Vijay M. Pai, No. 6, Vishnu Kunj, Brahmanwada Road, Matunga, Bombay-19.		'Documentary Release in Rural and Urban areas.
10.	Integrated Energy Programme	252.00	Directorate General of Information and Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra Film Center, 68, Tardeo Road, Bombay-34		'Documentary General Release.
11.	Mahitichitra No. 397	289.56	Asstt. Director of Inf. (F) Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research Laboratory, Worli, Bombay-400028.	Director of Administration, Govt. of Gujarat, Sachivalaya, Block -7, Gandhinagar, -382010.	'News and Current Events' Release in Gujarat circuit.
12.	Himalayan Enceavour	597.00	Films Division Govt. of India, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-400026.		'Documentary General Release.
13	Stepping Forward.	299.92	Gobordhan Adhikary Productions, 12, Sruddhar Roy Road, Calcutta-39.		'Documentary Release in West Bengal.

1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Energy In India's Development	597.41	Fali B limeria Production, Film Centre, 4th Floor, 68, Tardeo Road, Bombay-400034.			'Documentary' General Release.
15. Varta Tarangini No. 43.	309.00	Andhra Pradesh State Film Development Corporation Ltd., 11-5-423/1, Zafarbagh, Lakdi-ka-pool, Hyderabad-500004.			'News and Current Events' release in A.P. circuit.
16. Varta Tarangini No. 44	285.00	-do-			-do-
17. Mehboobnagar District	306.05	Venkat Varanasi, 5, Basant Vihar, 6th Road, Chembur, Bombay-400071.			'Documentary' Release in A.P. circuit.
18. Kumaonis On Kanet	304.00	Films Division, Govt. of India, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-400026.			'Documentary' General Release.
19. Maharashtra News No. 391	287.00	Directorate General of Information and Public Relations Govt. of Maharashtra Film Center, 68, Tardeo Road, Bombay-400034.			'News and Current Events' Release in Maharashtra circuit.
20. A Golden Gateway.	297.18	J.S. Bandekar. M-17, Ambedkar Nagar, Parel, Bombay-12.			'Documentary' General Release.
21. Stree-(Woman).	502.92	K. Ammajee, W/o K. Rajababu, Bharanipuram, Vijayawada.			'Documentary' Release in A.P. circuit.
22. Uttar Pradesh Samachar-108.	288.65	Director, Information and Public Relations, Govt. of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow.			'News and Current Events' Release in U.P. circuit only.
23. Mahitichitra No. 398	398.70	Asst. Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research Laboratory, 77, Dr. Annie Besant Road, Worli, Bombay-18.			'News and Current Events' Release in Gujarat circuit.
24. Bachat Gram	365.76	M/s. V.S. Enterprises 11, Rams hyam Nivas, Sitladevi Temple Road, Mahim, Bombay-16			'Documentary' General Release.
25. Friends Across The Seas.	360.00	Films Division, Govt. of India, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay-26.			'Documentary' General Release.
26. Navjiban.	70.00	-do-			-do-
27. Way To The Fair.	103.00	-do-			-do-
28. Taming of the River Mahi.	307.00	-do-			-do-
29. Ham Sab Bharatiya Hain.	169.00	Prem Prakash, Photographic Office, Armed Forces Film & Photo Division, Min. of Defence, New Delhi.	K.S. Kulkarni, Armed Forces Film & Photo Division, Min. of Defence, New Delhi-11.		-do-
30. Varta Tarangini No. 45	302.00	Andhra Pradesh State Film Development Corporation Limited, 11-5-423/1, Zafarbagh, Lakdi-ka-pool, Hyderabad-500004.			'News and Current Events' Release in A.P. circuit.
31. Gujarat Industries On The March.	599.85	Asstt. Director of Information (F) Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research Laboratory, 77, Dr. Annie Besant Road, Worli Bombay-400018	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Sachivalaya, Block 7, Gandhinagar 382010.		'Documentary' General Release
32. Subramanya Bharati.	268.83	Director, Information and Public Relations, Govt. of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow.			'Documentary' Release in U.P. circuit
33. Mahitichitra No. 399.	318.52	Asstt. Director of Information (F) Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research Laboratory, 77, Dr. Annie Besant Road, Worli, Bombay-400018.	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Sachivalaya, Block 7, Gandhinagar-382010.		'News and Current Events' Release in Gujarat circuit.
34. Bihar Samachar chitra No. 20.	266.70	M. Jha, Film Editor, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.	Director of Information & Public Relations, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.		'News and Current Events' Release in Bihar circuit.
35. Bihar Samachar-chitra No. 21.	268.22	-do-	-do-		-do-
36. Bihar Samachar-chitra No. 22.	284.99	-do-	-do-		-do-
37. Bihar Samachar Chitra No. 23.	270.66	-do-	-do-		-do-

1	2	3	4	5	6
38. Tambaccucha Safina	331.61	Durga Khote Productions, Malhotra House, 1st floor, Opp. G.P.O. Walchand Hirachand Marg, Bombay-1.			'Documentary' Release in Maharashtra circuit
39. Lok Adalat	396.24	Asstt. Director of Inf Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnora Research Laboratory, Ltd., 77 Dr. Annie Besant Road, Worli, Bombay 18.	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Sachivalaya, Block 7, Gandhinagar-382010		'Documentary' Release in Gujarat circuit.
40. Mineral Exploration	348.00	Films Division, Government of India, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-400026.			'Documentary' General release.
41. Exploring The Third Pole.	341.37	-do-			-do-
42. Madhya Pradesh Samachar Darshan 46.	275.84	Anand Harualme Co. Director Information & Publicity, Govt. of Madhya Pradesh, Bhopal.	Director, Information & Publicity Govt. of Madhya Pradesh, Bhopal		'News and Current Events' Release in M.P. circuit.
43. Mahitichitra No. 400.	288.04	Asstt. Director of Inf Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnora Research Laboratory Ltd. Worli Bombay.	Director of Information, Govt of Gujarat, Sachivalaya Block 7 Gandhinagar 382010.		'News and Current Events' Release in Gujarat circuit.
44. Maharashtra News No.392.	276.00	Directorate General of Information and Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, 68-Tradeo Road, Bombay-400034.			New and Current Events' Release in Maharashtra circuit.
45. Gujarat Stadium	278.89	Asst. Director of Inf (F) Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnora Research Laboratory Ltd 77 Dr. Ann Besant Road, Worli, Bombay-18.	Director of Information, Govt of Gujarat, Sachivalaya Block 7, Gandhinagar-382010		'Documentary'. Release in Gujarat circuit
64. My Experience	39.00	Films Division, Govt. of India, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-400026.			'Documentary' General release.
47. Nannhe Muane Bachche.	557.00	-do-			'Documentary Release in rural and semi urban areas.

[File No. 315/3/83-F (P)]
SUKUMAR MANDAL, Desk Officer

पर्यटन और नागर विमानन मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 1984

का०आ० 2730-वायुयान निगम अधिनियम, 1953 (1953 का 27) की धारा 4 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार तत्काल से एतद्द्वारा 2 वर्ष की अवधि के लिए एयर इंडिया तथा इंडियन एयरलाइन्स के निदेशक मंडलों का पुनर्गठन करती है जिनमें निम्नलिखित सदस्य होंगे :-

एयर इंडिया .

- | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. अंशकालिक अध्यक्ष,
एयर इंडिया | अध्यक्ष |
| 2. वायु सेना अध्यक्ष, | पदेन निदेशक |
| 3. सचिव | " |
| नागर विमानन | |

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 4. श्री नटवर सिंह,
सचिव, विदेश मंत्रालय | पदेन निदेशक |
| 5. अपर सचिव (बैकिंग)
वित्त मंत्रालय | " |
| 6. महानिदेशक (पर्यटन) | " |
| 7. प्रबन्ध निदेशक,
एयर इंडिया | " |
| 8. अध्यक्ष, भारत अंतरराष्ट्रीय
विमानपत्तन प्राधिकरण | " |
| 9. अंशकालिक अध्यक्ष,
इंडियन एयरलाइन्स | " |
| 10. प्रबन्ध निदेशक,
इंडियन एयरलाइन्स | " |
| 11. श्री जे०आर०डी० टाटा | गैर-सरकारी |
| 12. श्री जे०जी० रंगूनवाला | " |

इंडियन एयरलाइन्स		8. Chairman, International Airports Authority of India	Ex-Officio Director
1. अंशकालिक अध्यक्ष, इंडियन एयरलाइन्स	अध्यक्ष	9. Part-time Chairman, Indian Airlines.	"
2. वायुसेना अध्यक्ष	पदेन निदेशक	10. Managing Director, Indian Airlines	"
3. सचिव, नागर विमानन	"	11. Shri J.R.D. Tata,	Non-official
4. आर्थिक कार्य विभाग से प्रतिनिधि	"	12. Shri Zain G. Rangoonwala	"
5. सहानिदेशक (पर्यटन)	"	Indian Airlines :	
6. प्रबन्ध निदेशक, एयर इंडिया	"	1. Part-time Chairman, Indian Airlines	Chairman
7. प्रबन्ध निदेशक, इंडियन एयरलाइन्स	"	2. Chief of the Air Staff	Ex-officio Director
8. अध्यक्ष, भारत अंतर्राष्ट्रीय विमानन प्राधिकरण	"	3. Secretary, Civil Aviation	"
9. अंशकालिक अध्यक्ष, एयर इंडिया	"	4. Representative from Department of Economic Affairs	"
10. श्रीमती किश्वर शब्बीर खान	गैर-सरकारी	5. Director General, (Tourism)	"
[ए०वी० 18013/2/82-ए सी] जे०एन० कौल, संयुक्त सचिव		6. Managing Director, Air India	"
		7. Managing Director, Indian Airlines	"
		8. Chairman, International Airports Authority of India	"
		9. Part-time Chairman, Air India	"
		10. Mrs. Kishwar Shabbir Khan	Non-official

MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 1984

S.O. 2730.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 4 of the Air Corporations Act, 1953 (27 of 1953) the Central Government hereby reconstitute with immediate effect the Boards of Directors of Air India and Indian Airlines for a period of two years with the following members :

Air India.

1. Part-time Chairman, Air India	Chairman
2. Chief of the Air Staff	Ex-officio Director
3. Secretary, Civil Aviation.	"
4. Shri Natwar Singh, Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs	"
5. Addl. Secretary, (Banking) Ministry of Finance	"
6. Director General (Tourism)	"
7. Managing Director, Air India	"

संचार मंत्रालय

(डाक तार बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 18 अगस्त, 1984

क्रा. आ. 2731 :—स्थायी आदेश संख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1980 द्वारा लागू किये गये भारतीय तार नियम, 1951 के नियम 434 के खण्ड 3 के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिदेशक ने भुवनागिरि टेलीफोन केन्द्र में दिनांक 1-9-1984 से प्रमाणित घर प्रणाली लागू करने का निश्चय किया है।

[संख्या 5-8/84 पी. एच. बी.]

वाई. आर. भसीन, सहायक महानिदेशक
(पी. एन. बी.)

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

(P & T Board)

New Delhi, the 18th August, 1984

S.O. 2731.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specified 1st September, 1984 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Bhuvanagiri Telephone Exchange Andhra Pradesh Circle.

[No. 5-8/84-PHB]

Y. R. BHASIN, Asstt. Director Genl. (PHB)

अस और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय

(अस विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 12 जून, 1984

का. आ. 2732.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में भारतीय खाद्य निगम से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (i) के खंड (घ) द्वारा शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री एम. एन. राव होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या भारतीय खाद्य निगम का प्रबन्धनत्व द्वारा रोजगार कार्यालय द्वारा नामित उम्मीदवारों के साथ भूतपूर्व चौकीदार, श्री एम. राजा बली बेग, की नियुक्ति के लिए विचार न करना न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?”

[स. एन-42012/4/83-डी-4(बी)/डी-5]

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION

(Department of Labour)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 12th June, 1984

S.O. 2732.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an Industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Food Corporation of India and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri M. N. Rao, shall be the Presiding Officer with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the management of Food Corporation of India is justified in not considering Shri M. Raja Vah Brig. Ex-Watchman for appointment along with the Employment Exchange sponsored candidates? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

[No. L-42012(4)/83-D. 1V(B)/D.V.]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 12 जुलाई, 1984

का. आ. 2733.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में भारतीय खाद्य निगम से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विद्यमान है,

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है,

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (i) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री आई. पाण्डु रंगा राव होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या भारतीय खाद्य निगम, कुरुनूल का प्रबन्धनत्व की चौकीदार, श्री शेख अब्दुल बलीफ की 17-1-1977 से सेवानिवृत्त करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?”

[संख्या एन-42012/16/83-डी-4(बी)/डी-5]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 12th July, 1984

S.O. 2733.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Food Corporation of India and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri I. Pandu Ranga Rao shall be the Presiding Officer with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of the Food Corporation of India, Kurnool is justified in terminating the services of Shri Shaik Abdul Lateef, watchman w.e.f. 17-1-1977? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

[No. L-42012(16)/83 D-IV(B)/D.V]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 16 जुलाई, 1984

का. आ. 2734—इसमें उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद श्री एम. श्रीनिवास राव, पीठासीन अधिकारी, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के समक्ष लंबित पड़े हैं,

और श्री एम. श्रीनिवास राव की सेवाएं अब उपलब्ध नहीं रही हैं;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 33-ख की उपधारा (i) के साथ पठित धारा 7क के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री आर्. पांडू रंगाराव होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त श्री एम. श्रीनिवास राव, पीठासीन अधिकारी, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के समक्ष लंबित उक्त विवाद के संबद्ध कार्यवाही का वापस लेती है और उसे श्री आर्. पांडू रंगाराव, पीठासीन अधिकारी, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद को इस निर्देश के साथ स्थानांतरित करती है कि उक्त अधिकरण आगे कार्यवाही उस प्रक्रम में करेगा, जिस पर वह उसे स्थानांतरित की जाए तथा बिना के अनुसार उक्त उपपठन करेगा।

अनुसूची

अर्मांक भारत सरकार, अम संज्ञाख्या, पक्षकारों के नाम
नई दिल्ली के आदेश की
मुख्य और तारीख

1 2 3

1. सं० एल-22012/150/83- मैसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज
डी-3(बी) तारीख 18-5-84 क० लि०, रामाकृष्णपुर
डिवीजन-2, जिला

1	2	3
		अदिलाबाद के कर्मकार व प्रबंधन।
2. सं० एल-22012/146/83- डी-3(बी) तारीख 18-5-84		मैसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कंपनी लि०, मण्डाभरी डिवीजन, डाकघर कल्याणी- खानी, जिला अदिलाबाद के कर्मकार व प्रबंधन।
3. सं० एल-22012/151/83- डी-3(बी) तारीख 18-5-84		मैसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज क० लि०, रामाकृष्णपुर, डिवीजन-2, डाकघर-- रामाकृष्णपुर, जिला अदिलाबाद के कर्मकार व प्रबंधन।
4. सं० एल-43012/13/83- डी 3(बी) तारीख 18-5-84		मैसर्स आन्ध्र प्रदेश स हनिंग कार्पोरेशन, को भगाम- पेट खानें, डाकघर भगामपेट, जिला कुडा- पाह के कर्मकार व प्रबंधन।
5. सं० एल-42012/4/84- डी-4(बी) डी-5 तारीख 12-6-1984		भारतीय खाद्य निगम कुर- नूल के कर्मकार व प्रबंधन।
6. सं० एल-22012/147/83- डी-3(बी) तारीख 13-6-84		मैसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज क० लि०, बैकटेशखानी, जिला खम्माम के कर्म- कार व प्रबंधन।
7. सं० एल-22011/66/82- डी-3(बी) डी-2(बी) तारीख 6-6-84		मैसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज क० लि०, बेल्लामपाली, जिला अदिलाबाद के कर्मकार व प्रबंधन।
8. सं० एल-22012/35/83- डी-3(बी)/डी-2(बी) तारीख 16-6-1984		मैसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज क० लिमिटेड, रामा- गुंडम डिवीजन-I, डाक- घर--गोदावरीखानी, जिला करीमनगर के कर्मकार व प्रबंधन।
9. सं० एल-21012/27/83- डी-3(बी) डी-2(बी) तारीख 16-6-1984		मैसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज क० लि०, रामागुंडम डिवीजन-4 डाकघर-- गोदावरीखानी, जिला करीमनगर के कर्मकार व प्रबंधन।

1	2	3	1	2	3
10.	स० एल-15012/3/83- डी-2(बी) तारीख 16-6-84	कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम, हैदराबाद के कर्म- कार व प्रबंधनतंत्र ।			krishnapur Division-II, P.O. Ramakrishanapur, Dis- trict Adilabad.
11.	स० एल-22012/164/83- डी-3(बी) तारीख 18-6-84	मैसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज क० लिमिटेड कोटागुडम के कर्मकार व प्रबंधनतंत्र ।	4.	No. L-43012(183)D.III (B) dated 18-5-84	Workmen and the Management of Mangampet Barytes of M/s. Andhra Pradesh Mines Corporation P.O. Mangarnpet, District Cuda- pah.

[संख्या एल-11025/3/84-डी-4 (बी)]

एस० एस० मेहता, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 16th July, 1984

ORDER

S.O.2734: Whereas the industrial dispute specified in the Schedule here to annexed are pending before Shri M. Srinivasa Rao, the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad,

AND WEH&EAS the Services of Shri M. Srinivasa Rao are no longer available :

Now, Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7 A read with sub-section (1) of section 33B of the Industrial disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal, the Presiding Officer of which shall be Shri I. Pandu Rangarao with headquarters at Hyderabad and withdraws the proceeding in relation to the dispute pending before the said Shri M. Srinivasa Rao, Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad and transfers the same to Shri I. Pandu Rangarao, Presiding Officer Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad, with the direction that the said Tribunal shall proceed with the proceedings from the stage at which they are transferred to it and dispose of the same according to law.

SCHEDULE

Sr. Number and date of the Order of the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, New Delhi	Name of the Parties	
1	2	3
1. No. L-22012/150/83-D.III (B) dated 18-5-84	Workmen and the Management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramakrish- napur Division-II District Adilabad.	
2. No. L-22012(146)/83-III (B) dated 18-5-84	Workmen and the Management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Manda- mari Division P.O. Kalyani- khani, District Adilabad.	
3. No. L-22012/(151)/83-D.III (B) dated 18-5-84	Workmen and the Management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Rama	
		5. No. L-42012(4)/83-D. IV (B)/D.V. dated 12-6-84
		6. No. L-22012(147)/83-D.III. (B) dated 13-6-84
		7. No. L-22011/66/82-D. III (B)/D. II(B) dated 16-6-84.
		8. No. L-22012/35/83-D. III (B)/D. II (B) dated 16-6-84.
		9. No. L-21012/27/83-D. IKK (B)/D. II(B) dated 16-6-84.
		10. No. L-15012 (3)/83-D.II (B) dated 16-6-84.
		11. No. L-22012 (164)/83-D. III (B) dated 18-6-84.

[No. L-11025(3)/84-D.IV(B)]
S.S. MEHTA, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 14th August, 1984

S.O. 2735.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Food Corporation of India, Durgapur and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 7th July, 1984.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 106 of 1982

In the matter of an industrial dispute under S. 10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Food Corporation of India Durgapur and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the employers.—Shri D. K. Ghosh, Advocate.

On behalf of the workmen.—Shri D. L. Sengupta, Advocate.

STATE : West Bengal INDUSTRY : Food.

AWARD

Dhanbad, dated 30th July, 1984

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947, has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Order No. L-42011/9/82-FCI D.IV(A) dated Nil.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Food Corporation of India, Durgapur in not regularising and in not bringing the workmen, whose names are mentioned in the Annexure on regular scale of pay, is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?"

ANNEXURE

S. No. Name of workman

1. Shri Dilip Kr. Bhattacharjee
2. Shri Mangal Ch. Garai,
3. Shri Ashok Kr. Majhi,
4. Shri Purna Ch. Ghosh,
5. Shri Ram Kanta Sharma,
6. Shri Siv Kr. Roy,
7. Shri Bhola Nath Das,
8. Shri Bhagabat Bhattacharjee,
9. Shri Sk. Nur Ali Mallick,
10. Shri Shrimati Sabi Bauri.

11. Shrimati Bimala Bauri
12. Shrimati Asha Bauri.
13. Shrimati Menaka Bauri.
14. Shrimati Bela Bauri.
15. Shrimati Saraswari Bauri.
16. Shrimati Janani Bauri.
17. Shrimati Sita Reddy.
18. Shri Sakti Maity.
19. Shri Chadi Charan Mandal.
20. Shrimati Urmila Bauri.
21. Shrimati Chabi Bauri.

The case of the workman is that Food Corporation of India (hereinafter referred to as FCI) is a Government Company formed by an act of Parliament which came into existence on 14-1-1965. The object and business of the FCI is procurement of food grains, storing the same in different godowns and distributing it through its various agencies in different parts of India. The FCI has its head office at Delhi, 4 Zonal Office in Delhi, Calcutta, Bombay and Madras besides 19 Regional Offices, 5 Joint Manager's Offices, 135 District Offices and about 2000 depots all over India. The FCI employees over 72,000 workman including 14,000 Class-III and Class IV monthly paid staff in the Eastern Zone who are mostly the members of the Regional Director (Food) Employees Association, Calcutta (hereinafter referred to as RD(F) EA) which is affiliated to the All India Trade Union of FCI employees and workmans registered under the Indian Trade Union Act and recognised by the FCI and the Government of India. The concerned 21 workman are employed at the Food Storage Depot (hereinafter referred to as FSD) at Durgapur in Eastern Region of FCI w.e.f. 1-4-73 and thereafter as so called casual labour. The services of all the concerned 21 workman were continuous and regular and without any break since the date of their appointment as shown in Annexure A of their W.S. Out of the said 21 concerned workmen those who are appointed by the FCI w.e.f. 1-4-73 were working from before in the said depot since 1971-72 through a Contractor M/s. S. K. Ghosh. After abolition of the contract system the concerned 17 workmen were absorbed in Class IV cadre at FSD, Durgapur and the remaining four were appointed in the same cadre in 1975 and one in 1977. The services of all 21 concerned workmen were utilised in permanent posts against permanent nature of duties. They were working regularly 8 hours a day. After the abolition of contract labour system the FCI was directly employing the concerned workmen and was maintaining their attendance records, acquittance rolls and their wages, were paid directly by FCI. The FCI in day to day control and supervision of their work. The concerned workmen were working under the direction of the FCI in regard to their work and nature thereof. The FCI did not pay the concerned workmen the wages they were entitled as regular Class IV cadre of the FCI nor any annual increment, HRA, GPF and other benefits enjoyed by the permanent employees of the FCI doing identical jobs. Their wages were extremely low and almost at the rate as was being paid by the erstwhile contractor. They were also denied the amenities prevalent in the FCI including wages for Sundays and holidays. The treatment of the FCI to the con-

cerned workmen was illegal, unjust, arbitrary and unfair and in violation of the amendment to regulation 9(a) of the FCI (Staff) Regulation, 1971. The concerned workmen jointly and severally started making representations to different authorities since 26-4-1977. The concerned workmen authorised the union to take up their case but the management did not reply to the representations of the union. The Union referred the matter to the RLC(C) in Calcutta by a letter dated 15-7-81 and by letter dated 29-9-81 to the RLC(C) Asansol seeking intervention and Justice. Shri C. D. Dwivedi ALC(C)-II was entrusted by the RLC(C) to look into the matter and thereafter by letter dated 19/20-11-81, the ALC(C) requested the Joint Manager (Port Operation) FCI, Calcutta to furnish the comments of the management to the Union's letter dated 15-7-81. The union by a letter dated 28-11-81 to the ALC(C) authorised Shri Tapan Kumar Hazra, Secretary, West Bengal State Committee of the aforesaid union for representing the workmen and the union. The FCI raised the question of authorisation before the ALC(C) and after the same was communicated a fresh authorisation duly signed by all the concerned workmen was sent to the ALC(C) by a forwarding letter dated 18-12-81. The claim of the concerned workman and the union before the FCI and before the RLC(C) and the ALC(C) was that the concerned workmen be made permanent/regularised in services of the FCI with effect from the date of their respective appointment and they be provided with and fitted in regular scales of pay of FCI for Grade-IV employees and all other benefits and amenities which is being paid to Grade-IV employees. The conciliation proceeding before the ALC(C) failed and thereafter failure report was sent to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour and thereafter this reference was made. It is submitted that on the facts of the case it will appear that the concerned workmen were employees of regular and permanent nature doing regular and permanent jobs essential for the smooth running of the business of the FCI at Durgapur depot in which they were employed and it was a misnomer to call them casual workers in order to deprive them regular wages and benefits available to the regular and permanent Grade-IV employees of the FCI. The action of the FCI in not regularising and in not bringing the concerned workmen to the regular scale of pay Grade-IV was illegal and unjustified and it has been prayed that an Award be made in their favour.

The case of the management is that the reference is not maintainable since there does not subsist any relationship of employer and employee between the FCI and the concerned workman. The reference is also not maintainable as industrial dispute is conspicuous by its absence as the Regional Director (Food) Employees' Association has no locus-standi and representative character to espouse the cause of the concerned workmen. No proper dispute has been raised on behalf of the concerned workmen with the FCI and as such no industrial dispute exists. The FCI does not employ workmen directly on permanent basis. It recruits staff through Employment Exchange on certain terms and condition if there is any vacancy to any post. In FSD, Durgapur. The FCI has no constant, sure and regular supply of food grains. There were uncertainty and fluctuations in

the supply of Food grains. A contractor was engaged for the purpose of handling foodgrains bags at piece rate. The contractor employed his own labourers to do the work and the concerned workmen were also the labourers of the said contractor. The labourers of the contractor did not cooperate with the contractor causing disturbances and dislocation in the operations of godowns. Ultimately, the concerned workmen took up the job of the contractor collectively at the schedule rate of the contract. The concerned workmen had demanded that they should be treated as employees of the FCI by departmentalisation to which the FCI was not agreeable due to the fluctuations and uncertainty in the supply of food-grain and also for the sake of efficiency. It was agreed that the labourers may be given the work which the contractor had to do at the scheduled rate of the agreement and the payment would be made to the labourers through authorised representative nominated by the Union. As the concerned workmen were not the employees of the FCI, the management did not take the responsibility of making payment to each individual worker. On the ground that the payment was made to the workers collectively for the works under the contractor. The FCI insisted that some representatives of the labourers should receive the amount under the bill on behalf of all the workmen and in fact payments were made over to the representative of the workers who gave receipt therefor on the bills as representative of the union. The concerned workmen felt and expressed their incapability to select any authorised representative and prayed for payment from the FCI authority. The FCI authority used to pay the concerned workmen directly at a particular time as per bill prepared by them although the concerned workmen were covered under the direct payment system like the handling labourers. The FCI did not issue any appointment letter to the concerned workmen. The FCI has no control over the workmen and do not supervise their work. The FCI has only over all supervision over them in order to see that the work is done. The FCI did not record any attendance of the concerned workmen and they are not governed by the rules and regulations of the FCI. They cannot be punished or penalised for their lapses as in respect of the employees of the FCI. The FCI has nothing to do with their day to day employment and the concerned workmen do not require any permission to leave the place of work. There is no fixed time for their attendance and departure. There is no fixed duty hour for them. The services of the concerned workmen are required as and when situation arises. The number of heads required for a particular day depends on the volume of work. The nature of job of the concerned workmen is always extra temporary. They are paid on no work no pay basis.

The nature of work of the concerned workmen is not incidentally connected with any industry. Consequently the concerned workmen are not the employees in the service of FCI in the direct payment system and as such there is no question of their continuous and regular service with the FCI. There are many other casual labourers employed by the FCI and the regularisation of the concerned workmen cannot be treated in an isolated manner as much the entire labourers at FSD, Durgapur are

covered under the existing direct payment system. The regularisation co-related with regular scale of pay, depending upon the existing vacancy, qualification, age and sponsoring through employment exchange. The nature of work of the concerned workmen is totally dependent upon the requirement of the situation and as such no assessment is possible regarding the consistent requirement and consequently there is no scope for their regularisation. On the above facts it is submitted that Award be made that the management of the FCI is justified in not regularising the services of the concerned workmen as they are not the employees of FCI the question of bringing them on regular scale of pay does not arise.

1. The points for determination are: 1-whether, there is a relationship of employer and employee between the management and the concerned workmen.
2. Whether there is industrial dispute between the FCI and the concerned workmen.
3. Whether the concerned workmen had made a demand with the management in respect of the dispute in reference.
4. Whether the union has locus-standi to represent the concerned workmen.

Unless the relationship of master and servant is proved a person who claims to be a workman within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act cannot be said to be employed within the meaning of that clause; and if he was not employed he would not be a workman as defined by the said clause. A master is one who not only prescribes to the workman the end of his work, but directs or at any moment may direct the means also, or retains the power of controlling the work. Servant is a person subject to the command of his master as to the manner in which he shall do his work. An independent contract or is one who undertakes to produce a given result but so that in the actual execution of the work he is not under the order or control of the person for whom he does it and may use his own discretion in thing, not specified in before hand. The essential conditions of a person being a workman within the terms of the definition in Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act is that he should be employed to do the work in the industry, and that there should be relationship between the employer and him as between the employer and employee or the master and servant. The prima-facie test for the determination of relationship between master and servant is existence of the right for the master to supervise and control the work done by the servant not only in the matter of directing what work the servant is to do but also the manner in which he shall do his work. Keeping the above principles in view, we have to look into the evidence adduced in this case on the point whether the concerned workmen are the employees of FCI. Admittedly, the concerned workmen are working at FSD of FCI at Durgapur since 1973. The management do not deny about the work being performed by the concerned workmen at FSD, Durgapur. MW-1 Shri N. K. Roy who is Dy. Manager, Industrial Relations, FCI Calcutta has stated that previously there was a contract system and that at the instance of the FCI workers union, the maz-

doors became restive and the situation was such that the contractors had to give up their work and then it was decided that the work of that contractor be given to the labourers at the prevalent contractor's rate and the payment will be made through the representative of the workmen nominated by the union which according to him is known as direct payment system. The case of the management is that the concerned workmen actually were doing the work as they were doing under the contractors and they were not the workmen of FCI. MW-1 has further stated that there is no control of the management over the work of the concerned workmen and there is no direct supervision to supervise them and that the FCI does not maintain attendance of the concerned workmen. He has further stated that the services of the concerned workmen are not regulated by the rules of the FCI, the FCI does not penalise them for their lapses, they are not required to take permission in case of absence, they have no particular time for their arrival and departure, their services depend on the quantum of work and supply of the Food grains, the number of workmen to be employed on any particular day depends on the quantum of work to be done on that particular day and that the nature of their job is of the extra temporary employee. WW-2 Shri Dilip Kumar Bhattacharjee is one of the concerned workmen working as daily rated casual worker at FSD, Durgapur. He has stated that they are employees of FCI and that their work is regular. He has stated that their attendance is recorded by the Asstt. Manager, FSD, Durgapur and has challenged that if the management produces the said attendance register it would be established that they are regularly working and that the attendance registers was maintained by the management. He has stated that the Wage Bills are signed by the Asstt. Manager, FSD, Durgapur to show that FCI is making direct payment of their wages. He has stated that they are doing the work of shifting, brushing, cleaning the seats, technical operation and helping, bundling of bags sealing of godowns etc. and that the Asstt. Manager who is incharge of the FSD directs them to do which person should do which job. He has also stated that the work which is performed by them is the work of FCI. He has denied that they had ever agreed to receive their wages through any representative.

The management has filed attendance particulars in respect of casual labourers of FSD, Durgapur. They are Exts. M-1 to M-12, M-16 to M-24, M-27 to M-34 and casual labour charges bill of FSD, Durgapur Ext. M-13, 14, 15, M-25 and M-26 for different months of 1977, 1978, 1979, 1982 which will show that the concerned workmen were regularly working at FSD Durgapur. The notes on the attendance particulars show that the casual labourers were engaged for sweeping, cleaning, stitching, refilling etc. and helping the technical operations and that their engagement was justified as there was shortage of Class IV staff in the depot. The concerned workmen had given a chart showing the actual number of days worked yearwise and monthwise before the ALC (C) when the matter was pending for conciliation and the management had also appeared in the conciliation proceeding but the said figure has not been denied as actually W-80 dated 8-12-79 is a letter from Shri G. C. Majumdar, Dy. Manager (IR) to

the Zonal Manager East (FCI), Calcutta in respect of the regularisation of services of 22 casual workmen working in FSD Durgapur. It will appear from this letter that the concerned workmen were not working under the direct payment system rather it was the handling labourers who were working under the direct payment system. The concerned workmen were engaged on daily wage basis for cleaning the sheds and collecting sweeping and spilling and for performing other misc. jobs. It is further stated that these concerned workmen demanded regularisation of their services who were working in the particular depot from the very inception and as such, it was proposed that the Head Office should be apprised of the situation for reconsideration of the case in terms of Section 25(b) of the I.D. Act. Exts W-79, 14-6-80 written by MW-1 is also a proute to that effect. Ext. W-81 is a letter dated 26-6-79 by the Asstt. Manager, FSD Durgapur. It will appear from this letter that these workmen were working since 1973 after the abolition of the contract system as volume of work had increased due to heavy intake and offtake and they are working at FSD Durgapur as ancillary workers on direct payment system. Of course the fact whether the concerned workmen were working on direct payment system has been clarified by an Officer superior to him in Ext. W-80 which shows that the concerned workmen were not engaged in the direct payment system. Ext. W-82 dated 18/20-10-78 is a letter from K. S. Kohali, Joint Manager (Port Operation) to the Zonal Manager East (FCI) Calcutta regarding the employment of casual labour in ancillary jobs at FSD Durgapur. This letter as well will show that the 22 casual labourers (out of whom 21 are concerned workmen) are being continuously engaged since April, 1973 onwards and have been continuously working after May, 1977 and are engaged 6 days in a week. It is further stated that these workers are paid minimum rate of wages of Rs. 6.63 per day per worker as fixed by the Government of West Bengal for the unskilled known as agricultural labourer. It is further stated that their attendance is being marked at the depot office and they are paid their wages individually through the acquittance rolls at the depot office. It is stated that as these workers are not engaged in the depot on work of intermittent or casual work and are engaged, on regular type of work after May, 1977 continuously, they shall cease to be casual worker having completed one year of continuous service in accordance with the provision of the explanation to Section 25C of the I. D. Act., 1947 and that the concerned workmen could not be treated as casual worker as they are not working or acting in the vacancy of any permanent workman. A reference has been made of a case Laxmi Mills Co. reported in 1965 Vol. I LLJ P-92 to show that the casual workmen who completed one year of continuous service ceased to be a casual worker and that such worker will be regarded as regular worker. It is also stated that cessation of work of the concerned workmen of one day in a week is not due to any fault but on their part and this should not come in the way of counting of their services as continuous in the light of the provision of Section 25(b) of the I. D. Act. It is stated that when the workers are engaged continuously in regular type of work for more than a year and their requirement is still there in the depot for doing the various type of ancillary jobs of a permanent nature there is

strong case for their regularisation. The internal letter communications of the FCI show that the concerned workmen were in regular and continuous service of FSD Durgapur. It will also appear from Exts. which I have mentioned above that the concerned workmen had completed more than 240 days of service each year since 1973.

On behalf of the workmen a petition was filed on 21-3-83 praying that the employer should produce the original of ten items of para -2 of petition besides the attendance registers and acquittance rolls of the concerned workmen for the period from April, 1973 to March 1983. The management was asked to produce those document in their possession and were also directed that the management may file a petition in respect of the documents which they are unable to produce. The management did not produce those documents and as such the concerned workmen exhibited some of those documents. Annexure OPQR to the W.S. of the workmen have been marked as Ext. W-79 to W-82. These documents were referred in para 28 of the W. S. of the workmen and the management gave its reply in para 19 of their W. S. showing that they are matters of record and did not deny the existence of those annexures. These were the documents original of which were also called for from the management by the petition dated 21-3-83. The management in the end when the hearing was going on 19-6-84 filed a petition giving explanation for not having filed the attendance registers acquittance rolls of the concerned workmen and also it was stated on behalf of the management that the Ext. O, P, Q, R are not on the record of the FCI. These documents were internal communication and it has come in the evidence that there is registers of internal communications to show what letters internally passed in the Office. But the management did not produce the said register to show that no such document were internally communicated. It was for the management to show by the document that these internal communications had not been made when the concerned workmen were asserting its existence from the very time of the filing of their W. S. In my opinion, all these documents annexure O to R which are marked as Ext. W-79 to W-82 were copies of the internal communications and that the originals have been suppressed by the management so that the case of the concerned workmen may not be established. The workmen got those documents supported by the papers in the RLC(C) file. None of the persons from FSD Durgapur has come forward to depose in the case on behalf of the management. MW-1 Shri N. K. Roy is working at Calcutta Office and MW-2 Shri H. C. Biswas who is working as Chief Labour Inspector has not worked as Asstt. Manager who is incharge at FSD Durgapur. These MW-1 and M-2 do not appear to be the competent witnesses to say about the facts prevalent at FSD, Durgapur. It is stated by MW-2 that no disciplinary action is taken by the FCI against the concerned workmen. In this connection Ext. W-28 may be referred to show that the management had proposed to take action against Shri Sik Kumar Roy one of the concerned workman. Thus it cannot be said that the management was not taking disciplinary action against the concerned workman.

It will appear from the attendance particulars and casual labour charge bills to show that the Wage

Bills were signed by the Asstt. Manager, FSD, Durgapur and by the Chief Labour Inspector; and the district Manager of the FCI management. The district Manager releases and passes the amount of wages to the workmen and so FCI was their employer. MW-2 has stated that the total is passed by the District Manager and that the Labour Inspector, Chief Labour Inspector also used to sign the bills. He has stated that the attendance is certified for its correctness by the depot incharge. It is clear, therefore, that the FCI was the Pay master of the concerned workmen.

MW-2 has stated that they were doing the work under the direction and supervision of the FCI management. MW-2 has clearly stated that the Asstt. Manager in charge of the FSD Durgapur, directs them as to which person should do which work. The management has remained silent as to who looks after or supervise the concerned workmen. It was a different matter when the concerned workmen were working under the contractor and at that time the contractor was supervising their work ever since the contract system was abolished, there must have been some persons to guide and see that the work is being done by the concerned workmen. MW-2 has clearly stated that they were working under the supervision of the Asstt. Manager, FSD Durgapur and there is no evidence of the management on the contrary to show that the Asstt. Manager, FSD was not supervising and directing the work of the concerned workmen. I hold, therefore, that the work of the concerned workmen were supervised and guided by the management.

The nature of work done by the concerned workmen are almost admitted. MW-1 and MW-2 have stated that the concerned workmen are to do Sweeping, cleaning spilling and some other misc. jobs. MW-2 has stated that preservation of Foodgrains is a policy matter of the FCI. If this is a policy matter of the FCI, the work of the concerned workmen in sweeping, cleaning spilling, stritching spraying of insecticides, fumigation salvaging are all done by the concerned workmen in order to preserve the food grains, which are stocked at FSD Durgapur. MW-2 has admitted that all these operations done by the concerned workmen are part of the operations of the FCI. It is clear from the evidence in the case that the work of the concerned workmen are an integral part of the operations of the FCI.

All the evidence discussed above shows that the concerned workmen are in fact the regular of the FCI and are not casual employees.

When a reference is made under Section 10 of the I.D. Act, there is a presumption of existence of an industrial dispute. The said presumption is no doubt a rebuttable one. For the purpose of rebutting the said presumption evidence is required to be adduced by the employers. It will appear from the evidence in the case that the 21 concerned workmen are a separate entity known as daily rated monthly paid ancilliary workers of FSD, Durgapur of the FCI management. There is no evidence on behalf of the management that there are other workmen in FSD Durgapur like the concerned workmen. Their

job is entirely different from the job of the other workmen of FSD at Durgapur. The concerned workmen are well defined and distinct category of workmen having their one distinct interest involved in the dispute. Other workmen working in FSD Durgapur have no interest with the concerned workmen and as such the concerned workmen represented the total number of daily rated monthly paid ancilliary worker of FSD, Durgapur. They are, therefore 100 per cent of the total number of the daily rated monthly paid ancilliary workers of FSD at Durgapur. It is needless to say, which is supported by the evidence in the case that the operations of the FCI is achieved by the Joint effort and team work in which the concerned workmen also play important part. The work being performed by the concerned workmen was an important part of FCI and had it not been so there was no point for the FCI engaged in its business to keep the concerned workmen regularly and continuously since the year 1973. The concerned workmen did a particular specified type of work and thereby contributed in the achievement of the goal of the FCI in saving and protecting the food grains from being wasted and spoiled. In view of the above it has to be held that the concerned workmen have also the capacity to cause impediment to the working and undertaking of the FCI. As the concerned workmen constitute a class by themselves and as they are in a position to affect the working of the FCI, the dispute raised by them is an industrial dispute in as much as 100 per cent of them have supported the dispute as will appear from their demand made vide Ext. W-71 dated 29-12-78, W-75 dt. 16-11-79, W-55 dated 11-2-80, Ext. W-56 dated 18-11-80, Ext. W-57 dated 9-4-81. The learned advocate appearing on behalf of the workmen has referred to the decision reported in 1961 (2) LLJ 436 (Bombay Union of Journalists vs The Hindu). It will appear from the said case that the newspaper the Hindu had office at Bombay and at the material time there were only nine employees besides the workmen of that case namely Sallivatee Eswaran out of whom seven of the employees were serving on the administrative side and two were journalist, Sallivatee Eswaran and Venkateswaran were members of the Bombay Union of Journalist. They are journalist employees. Tewary was not a member of the Union. The Bombay union of Journalist is a trade union, the membership of which were open to all persons who depended for the livelihood upon the practice of the profession of journalism including press photographers, Artist etc. but it was not a union of the workmen of the Hindu. Their Lordships of the Supreme Court in the said case observed "In each case in ascertaining whether an industrial dispute has acquired the character of industrial dispute, the test is whether at the date of the reference the dispute was taken up as supported by the union of the workmen and the employees against whom the dispute was raised by an individual workman or by an appreciable number of workmen". The Hindu had other employees but the working journalist were only three in number out of whom one had raised the dispute and according to the Supreme Court if out of the remaining journalist one had supported Sallivatee Eswaran it would have been an industrial dispute. In the present case it will appear that all the twenty one concerned workmen were the total number of

workmen who formed a distinct category of workmen and as all the concerned workmen have joined in raising the dispute the same has become an industrial dispute. Another case was also referred on behalf of the learned Advocate for the workmen namely, 1980 LIC-P. 92 (M/s. Reckitt & Colman of India Ltd.). The said case was in respect of Mot Drivers in which 12 Car drivers out of 18 had raised the dispute. Their Lordships of the Calcutta High Court held in the decision on the principle of the decision reported in 1961 LLJ-P-436 held that the 12 Car drivers formed a substantive part of the total number of 18 drivers forming a particular class or category in the industry and as such the dispute raised by the 12 drivers was an industrial dispute. Considering all the aspects I hold that the concerned twenty one workmen formed a distinct category of workmen who had raised the dispute and as such the dispute raised by them is an industrial dispute.

The above findings has been made alternatively as it will appear from the facts in the evidence of the case that the case of the concerned workmen was taken up by Regional Director Food Employees Association which is a union in respect of the workmen of FCI. It has been submitted on behalf of the management that the said union had no locus-standi to represent the concerned workmen. MW-1 has stated that the Regional Director Food Employees Association is not recognised by the FCI. But it will appear from the documents adduced in this case that the said union had its office in 5th Floor of FCI's premises at 4, Mangoe Lane, Calcutta. MW-1 has tried to suppress the very existence of the office of the said union existing at 5th Floor of FCI's Premises at 4 Mangoe Lane, Calcutta. Ext. W-6 dated 7-3-72 is a letter by the Zonal Manager of FCI to the Secretary, Regional Director Food Employees Association, 4 Mangoe Lane, Calcutta. Here the management has given the address of the office of the Secretary of Regional Director Food Employees Association at 4 Mangoe Lane, Calcutta where the office of the FCI is situated. It will appear from this letter that the Zonal Manager had a grievance when a large number of workmen of RDE(F) Association went to the Zonal Office and held demonstration and some also met the Zonal Manager to present their various demands. The Zonal Manager had written to the Secretary, RDE (F) Association and that when there was an association there it was for the representatives of the association to put their demands in writing and seek discussion and there is no reason as to why the said no mal channel for discussion of demand across the table is not being adhered to. The Zonal Manager asked the association to dissuade its constitution from indulging any such demonstration in future and maintain a healthy and cordial atmosphere for negotiations. It will thus appear from this letter that the management was fully recognising the RDE(F) Association located at 4 Mangoe Lane, Calcutta as representative of the workmen of FCI. Ext. W-7 is a photostat copy of letter dated 15-5-72 by the Senior Dy. Manager of FCI to the Secretary Regional Director (F) Employees Association informing the date of the quarterly meeting and requesting the Secretary to send the names of their representative who will attend the meeting. Ext. W-8 dated 24-5-72 is another letter

by the Senior Dy. Manager to the Secretary, Regional Director (F) Employees Association requesting the Secretary to send the names of the representative who will attend the meeting. Ext. W-10 is photo copy of a certificate dated 12-6-72 by Senior Dy. Manager certifying the names of the persons who had attended the meeting of the quarterly meeting of the Zone at Ranchi. It will show that the representative of Regional Director (Food) Employees Association had attended the said meeting. Ext. W-11 dated 7-7-72 is a letter from the Zonal Manager requesting the cooperation of all members of the said organisation of FCI. This letter was sent to the Regional Director (Food) Employees Association, 4 Mangoe Lane, Calcutta. Ext. W-14, dated 29-3-73, Ext. W-15 dated 13-4-73 W-16 dated 14-4-82, W-17 dated 5-2-82 are some of the other documents to indicate that the FCI authorities were dealing with the Regional Director (F) Employees Association in respect of the workmen working in FCI. It is clear from the above documents that the management was recognising the Regional Director (F) Employees Association to represent the workmen of FCI, and now it is too much to deny their representative capacity. Even MW-1 has stated at p-5 of his cross-examination that when he was an employee of Regional Director, Food he was a member of the Regional Director (F) Employees Association which was the only union at that time. MW-1 who is Secretary of Regional Director Food Employees Association stated that about 75 per cent of the total strength of the Employeets of the Eastern Zone were members of his association in 1982. He has also stated that the concerned workmen are the members of his union which recognised by the FCI and the Government of India. He has stated that the FCI has provided office for his union at 5th Floor, 4 Mangoe Lane, Calcutta which is in the premises of the office of the Joint Manager, Port Operation. MW-2 has stated that the Regional Director (F) Employees Association is the biggest union in the FCI Organisation. No doubt the union have not produced membership register, minute book, subscription register etc. It is stated on behalf of the concerned workmen that the management had not raised this dispute at the time when the dispute was pending before the ALC(C) Asansol and that at the time only the question raised on behalf of the management was about the authorisation by the workmen to the union. Ext. W-2 is the memo of ALC(C) Asansol dated 14-12-81. It will appear from this memorandum the District Manager and the Chief Labour Inspector of the FCI Durgapur were present on behalf of the employee before the ALC(C) on 14-12-81 and that the employers representatives raised a question of authorisation by the workmen to the union only to which the union representative

assured that they will furnish the same to the management within a week. It is stated on behalf of the concerned workmen that the management had raised only the question whether the concerned workmen had authorised the union to represent them and that the management had not raised the question that Regional Director (F) Employees Association was not a recognised union of the FCI. Subsequently the authorisation of all the concerned workmen were filed by the union before the ALC(C) Asansol vide Ext. M-76. Considering the entire evidence it will appear that Regional Director (F) Employees Association was the recognised union by the FCI and that the said union was representing the case of the concerned workmen.

But even if it is held that the Regional Director (Food) Employees Association had not the representative capacity, the same is immaterial in this case inasmuch as all the 21 concerned workmen forming a distinct class in themselves had all raised the dispute and as such the dispute raised by them is an industrial dispute. However as the evidence stands I hold that the Regional Director (Food) Employees Association has the locus-standi to represent the concerned workmen.

It has been submitted on behalf of the management that no demand was raised in respect of the dispute which has been raised in the reference. Ext. W-71 dated 29-12-73 is a letter written by the concerned workmen to the Zonal Manager (Port Operation) FCI, 4 Mangoe Lane, Calcutta for finally absorbing them as they are workmen under the control of FCI since 1973. This is signed by all the concerned workmen. This was sent by a Regd. letter. Ext. W-72, is the Acknowledgement Card of the said letter showing that the letter was received in the office of the FCI on 3-1-79. WW-2 has stated that one letter was sent by hand which was accepted by the Office. Ext. W-75 is another letter by 6 of the concerned workmen dated 16-11-79 addressed to the Zonal Manager (East) FCI containing the signature of the 6 concerned workmen. Through this letter also a prayer was made to regularise them. Ext. W-55 dated 11-2-80 is a letter written by 19 of the concerned workmen for their absorption and regularisation with difference of salary and other financial benefits. It is stated in it that they get payment directly from the FCI and that they do shifting, brushing, cleaning, stitching, sealing, spraying fumigation and salvaging etc. since 1973 as daily rated employees without any break. Ext. W-56 dated 18-11-1980 is also a letter by 19 concerned workmen before the Joint Manager Port Operations for their regularisation in services by absorption with retrospective effect. Ext. W-57 is a letter written by Shri Asru Bose, Secretary of Regional Director (Food) Employees Association Union to the Joint Manager Port Operations (FCI) demanding regularisation of the services of the concerned workman working at Durgapur FSD of FCI. All the above documents coupled with the evidence of WW-2 show that demand was made with the FCI management by the workmen themselves and also by the union requesting for their regularisation in services since

1973. The earliest letter Ext. W-71 was sent through Regd. Post and Ext. W-72 shows that the same was received in the Office and as such it cannot be said that no demand had been raised by the concerned workmen. Ext. W-57 will further show that a demand on behalf of the concerned workmen was made by the Union. I hold, therefore that the concerned workmen and their union had made a demand with the management in respect of the dispute in the reference.

It has been submitted on behalf of the management that there was a notification dated 4th of February, 1976 by which regulation 9(a) was added to FCI Staff Regulation, 1971 by which the concerned workmen could have participated for direct recruitment in accordance with the rules provided in it. The case of the concerned workmen is that their case was not covered by the said circular. The said circular and notification has been marked as Ext. W-4 in this case and the staff regulation 1971 also incorporates this proviso in regulation 9(a). The case of the concerned workmen is that they were in continuous employment of the FCI since 1973 and as such they had acquired the status of regular employees of FCI and as such their case could not be covered by the said circular. Moreover, they were working since before 1973 firstly under the contractor and thereafter since 1973 under the FCI and many of the concerned workmen had become overage and could not apply for appointment under the circular. Moreover, the management had never asked the concerned workmen to appear for interview before the appointing authority. As case of the concerned workmen is quite distinct, the same cannot be covered under the proviso of Clause 9(a) of the Regulation. It does not behave well on the part of the management to deny regularisation of the concerned workmen to Category IV services when they have regularly and continuously worked for FCI. Admittedly, the concerned workmen are getting wages less than the wages of Grade-IV employees to which grade their work belongs and the management is not regularising only because they will have to pay more to the concerned workmen. I hold, therefore, that the management is discriminating between one employee and the other of FCI.

Taking the entire facts, evidence and circumstances of the case into consideration I hold that the action of the management of FCI, FSD at Durgapur in not regularising and in not bringing the concerned workmen on regular scale of pay is unjustified. The concerned workmen are regularised in the services of the FCI as Grade-IV regular employees with retrospective effect from one year after the date of their respective

appointment as shown in annexure A to the W.S. annexed herewith. The concerned workmen are also entitled to the difference of wages from the date of

their regularisation in Grade-IV with all other benefits and amenities of Grade-IV regular employees.

This is my Award.

ANNEXURE--A

Particulars in respect of casual labourers working at F.S.D Durgapur.

Sl. No.	Name of C/Labour	Caste	Educational qualification	Date of birth	Date of appointment	Employment exchange Reg. No.
1	2	3	4	5	6	
1.	Sri Dilip Kr. Bhattacharjee	—	B. Com passed (with knowledge of typewriting speed of 40 w.p.m.)	26-6-53	1-4-73	D-9181/73
2.	„ Mongal Chandra Gorai	—	Class VIII passed	20-10-55	1-4-73	RR-4511/77
3.	„ Ashok Kr. Majhi	—	-do-	19-10-55	1-4-73	T-975/78
4.	„ Purna Ch. Ghosh	—	-do-	31-1-53	1-4-73	RR-27239/72
5.	„ Ran Kanta Sharma	—	Nil	24-10-51	1-4-73	RR/26911/72
6.	„ Siv Kumar Roy	—	Class VIII passed	12-2-48	1-4-73	T-140/76
7.	„ Bhola Nath Das	—	-do-	17-3-51	1-4-73	T-446/77
8.	„ Bhagabat Bhattacharjee	—	-do-	14-9-41	1-4-73	T-461/77
9.	„ Sk. Nur Ali Mollick	—	S.F. (Supplementary)	22-2-56	1-4-73	D-2776/74
10.	Smt. Sabi Bauri	SC	Nil	24-10-56	1-4-73	W-957/76
11.	„ Bimala Bauri	SC	Nil	4-12-47	1-4-73	W-959/76
12.	„ Asha Bauri	SC	Nil	3-11-48	1-4-73	W-156/73
13.	„ Menka Bauri	SC	Nil	23-8-52	1-4-73	W-361/74
14.	„ Bala Bauri	SC	Nil	1-12-53	1-4-73	W-932/76
15.	„ Saraswati Bauri	SC	Nil	28-9-50	1-4-73	W-931/76
16.	„ Janani Bauri	SC	Nil	18-11-48	1-4-73	W-956/76
17.	„ Sita Reddy	—	Nil	14-10-49	1-4-73	W-1294/76
18.	Sri Sakti Mistry	—	Class VIII passed.	23-10-54	25-1-75	RR-17251/71
19.	Sri Chandi Charan Mandal	—	-do-	12-5-55	14-3-77	T-900/78
20.	Smt. Urmila Bauri	SC	Nil	10-12-56	1-11-75	W-955/76
21.	„ Chabi Bauri	SC	Nil	25-10-58	1-4-75	W-731/76

I. N. SINHA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-42011(9)|82-FCI|D. IV (A)|DV]

New Delhi, the 16th August, 1984

S.O. 2736.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Chanda Rayatwari Colliery of WCL and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 7th August, 1984.

BEFORE JUSTICE SHRI K. K. DUBE, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(68) 1983.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Chanda Rayatwari Colliery in Sub-Area No. 3, Wardha Valley Area of Messrs Western Coalfields Limited, Chandrapur and their workmen, represented by the General Secretary, Lal Zhanda Coal Mines Mazdoor Union, Machhi Nala, Bengali Camp, Chandrapur (M.S.)

APPEARANCES :

For Union—Shri S. R. Pendre, General Secretary.

For Management—Shri P. S. Nair, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal DISTRICT : Chandrapur (M.S.)

AWARD

Dated July 26, 1984

Central Government in exercise of its powers under Sec. 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following question for adjudication, vide Notification No. L-22011(36)82-D.II(B) dated 20th December, 1983 :

"Whether the management of Chanda Rayatwari Colliery Sub-Area No. 3, Wardha Valley Area of M/s Western Coalfield, Limited, Chandrapur is justified in awarding punishment of suspension for the period from 18-10-1978 to 8-11-1973 and demotion from category III to Badli worker, to Shri Shrikrishna Rushi Pendre. Timberman is justified? If not, to what relief the workman, is entitled?"

2. At the relevant time the workman, Shrikrishna Rushi Pendre was working as Timber Mazdoor in the services of Chanda Rayatwari Colliery Sub-Area No. 3, Wardha Valley Area under the Western Coalfields Ltd. Chandrapur. He was suspended and demoted from Category III to Badli worker. The Union, therefore, took up his case and raised a dispute as to the legality of suspension and demotion. The Workman Shrikrishna Rushi appeared before the Tribunal and stated on oath that he has left the services of the Colliery and does not wish to join them. Since the question is of demotion it would not subsist as the workman has already left the services. The relief in this regard has become infructuous. Since he does not want full pay or any other relief for the period of suspension the question whether the suspension is justified does not survive. I therefore make the award as under :—

The workman having left the services and not intending to rejoin the question of his demotion and the consequential relief, have become infructuous. The relief and the legality of suspension have also become infructuous in view of the fact that the workman does not want any relief.

There shall be no order as to costs.

K. K. DUBE, Presiding Officer.

[No. L.22011(36)82-D.III(B).D.V.]

S.O. 2737.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Indian Rare Earths Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 7th August, 1984.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, BOMBAY.

Reference No. CGIT-2 12 of 1984

PARTIES :

Employers, in relation to the Management of Messrs Indian Rare Earths Limited

AND

Their Workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the employers : Shri S. K. Wadia, Advocate

For the workman : Shri Placid Ignatius (Workman in person)

INDUSTRY : Mines

STATE : Maharashtra

AWARD

Bombay, dated the 26th July, 1984

By their order No. L-43012 182-D.III(B) D.IV(B) dated 25-3-84 the following dispute has been referred for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act :—

"Whether the punishment of dismissal from service awarded by the management of M/s. Indian Rare Earths Ltd. to Shri Placid Ignatius, Operator Grade-I is disproportionate to the alleged offence? If so, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. As the order of reference stands what is referred is for consideration regarding the punishment or dismissal from service passed against the workman namely whether it is disproportionate to the alleged misconduct. The proof of misconduct therefore has been presumed and what is left to be determined is whether the punishment is harsh and disproportionate.

3. In the statement of claim various contentions regarding the enquiry have been raised. Similarly it is alleged that the workman was not called upon to show cause as to why the punishment of dismissal should not be awarded but all these contentions are irrelevant and once we have the presumption of misconduct duly established what we have to consider whether the order of dismissal was warranted or not.

4. The management supports the said order by written statement Ex-3M and in support is contended that previously also the workman was involved in commission of various misconducts. In para. 6 of the written statement the earlier history has been narrated and it is stated that for misconduct dated 3-2-1972 when the workman had taken the company's vehicle unauthorisedly and by misguiding the driver and also leaving the premises of company without getting his card punched, a warning was issued on 3-2-1972. Then there is a reference to other misconducts first dated 8-7-1978 and second dated 13-9-1979, on which occasion I am given to understand the enquiry officer had duly recorded the finding of guilt but no action was taken by the company at the instance of the Union. I can understand an oral request being considered but at least when the enquiry was held on two occasions and finding of guilt was noted on both these occasions somewhere some record should appear thereby the enquiry papers were filed but nothing like this has happened and how has remained unexplained. I am therefore not taking into account of these two alleged misconducts. Even then there is an incident dated 5-5-1980 when the workman refused to work in I.

Attack Section and to complete I Attack fitation, as result of which there was an action and an ex-parte enquiry was held in which the charge was held proved and the punishment of 10 days suspension was awarded.

5. An incident is alleged to have occurred on 22-12-1980 that is soon after return from the period of suspension when it is alleged that the workman refused to carry out the lawful and reasonable orders of the superiors to work in the S.B.P. Section which work was allotted to him by the superior namely the Foreman of the Plant. Enquiry was held when the explanation called for was found to be unsatisfactory. The company therefore says that in view of the past conduct and in view of the seriousness of the misconduct namely refusal to carry out the orders of the superiors the punishment of dismissal awarded after the charge was held proved was the only punishment warranted.

6. On the above pleadings the following issues arise for determination and my findings thereof are :—

ISSUES	FINDINGS
1. Whether the punishment of dismissal awarded to Shri Placid Ignatious is disproportionate to the alleged misconduct?	No
2. If yes, to what relief the workman is entitled?	Normally should not arise but on humanitarian ground certain reliefs are granted.
3. What award?	As per order.

REASONS

7. As already observed we need not go into the question of enquiry etc. in the light of the order of reference which order gives jurisdiction to this Tribunal to adjudicate the matter under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act and the question which remains to be decided is whether the punishment awarded is justified or in any way disproportionate.

8. A reference is already made to the two previous orders namely first a warning Memo, dated 8-2-1972, and secondly the order dated 4-12-1980 whereby the workman was placed under suspension for 10 days with effect from 5-12-1980. On that occasion also the charge was willful insubordination or disobedience and though the Factory Manager was of the opinion that the misconduct proved against him was of a serious nature and deserved the punishment of dismissal from service, he refrained from doing so and a lenient punishment of suspension for 10 days was awarded. The record shows that soon thereafter i.e. on 22-12-1980 the workman indulged in similar misconduct and refused to carry out the orders issued by his superior. When he was employed to perform certain duties, it was incumbent on such workman to perform the work as entrusted to him and if he had

any grievance to represent to the superiors. He could never have refused to carry out the work that too when already for similar misconduct he had been given the punishment of suspension for 10 days. In my view, therefore having regard to the past, and even after ignoring the incidents referred to in para 6 clauses (i) to (iii) of the written statement, even then the misconduct proved was serious and if the competent authority decided to dismiss him the order cannot be said to be harsh and disproportionate.

9. However while disposing of the case I am taking into consideration the period of service put in by the workman namely 25 years and I am conscious that the order of dismissal would deprive the workman of the gratuity and compensation otherwise he would have got in case of retrenchment. While confirming the order therefore I am directing the management to the gratuity and compensation otherwise he would have been payable to him on the date of dismissal, and also to award him a sum equal to retrenchment compensation which would have been payable under Section 25F of the Act had he been retrenched on the relevant date. The concession which I am awarding is however on compassionate ground and this does not mean that I am holding the order of dismissal to be disproportionate or harsh. I am maintaining that the workman deserved the said order but on humanitarian and compassionate ground I am allowing the two concessions in the above order. In case any legal hitch is experienced in payment of gratuity the punishment of dismissal shall be treated as that of termination but without any right for reinstatement in view of the reliefs as awarded namely payment of an amount equal to retrenchment compensation and the amount of gratuity.

Award accordingly.

No order as to costs.

M. A. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer
[No. L-43012(1)/82-D.II(B)/D.IV(B)/D.V]
S. S. MEHTA, Desk. Officer.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 16 जुलाई 1984

का० अ० 2738.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाखण्ड अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में मैसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कंपनी लि०, कोठामुडियम के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के निम्न निर्देशों द्वारा वादग्रस्त समझती है;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री आई० पांडू रंगा राव होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्विघ्न करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या मसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज क० लिमिटेड, डाकघर वेकटेशखानी के प्रबंधन के सं० 5 बी इन्कलाइन में कोल फिलर, श्री के० अप्पाला राजू, को 29-10-1983 सेवा से बर्खास्त करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?”

[संख्या एल-22012/24/84-डी-3(बी)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 16th July, 1984

S.O. 2738.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Singareni Collieries Coal Ltd. Kothagudum and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri I. Pandu Ranga Rao shall be the Presiding Officer with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the management of Messrs Singareni Collieries Coal Ltd., Venkatesh Khani P.O. are justified in dismissing from service with effect from 29-10-83 Shri K. Appala Raju, Coal Filler, No. 5B Incline? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?”

[No. L-22012(24)/84-D. III (B)]

आदेश

का० आ० 2739—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में केरल सेरेमिक्स लि०, कुदरा के प्रबंधन से संबद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री के० एस० गुरुमूर्ति होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय मद्रास में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या कुन्दरा सेरेमिक स्टाफ एम्प्लोयेशन, कुन्दरा विक्लोन् जिले की केरल सेरेमिक्स लि० के विक्लोन् डिब्बी-जन के एक कर्मकार श्री टी० स्लीट्स को प्रतिष्ठान के कर्मकारों को प्रथमोपचार देने के लिए मार्च, 1980 से 20/- रुपये मासिक विधेय भत्ता देने की

मांग न्यायोचित है? यदि हां, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?”

[संख्या एल-29012/7/84-डी-3 (बी)]

ORDER

S.O. 2739.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Kerala Ceramics Ltd., Kundara and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7 of clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri K. S. Gurumurthy shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Madras and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Is the Kundara Ceramic Staff Association, Kundara, Quilon District justified in demanding payment of Special Allowance of Rs. 20 per month to Shri T. Clitus, a worker of the Kaollu Division of Kerala Ceramics Ltd., for rendering first aid to the workmen of the establishment from March, 1980 onwards? If so, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?”

[No. L-29012/7/84-D.III (B)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 19 जुलाई, 1984

का० आ० 2740—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में मसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज क० लि०, डाकघर-रामकृष्णपुर, जिला अदिलाबाद (आ० प्र०) के प्रबंधन से संबद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है,

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री आई० पांडू रंगाराव होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या मसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज क० लि०, रामकृष्णपुर डिब्बीजन-2, डाकघर-रामकृष्णपुर के प्रबंधन के आ० के० 8 इंकलाइन के सामान्य मजदूर सर्वश्री गजेल्ला कोनहैया और बेलाडीसामबाया को जुलाई, 1981 से राजमिस्त्री के किये गये कार्य के लिए वर्ग-4 का वतन देने से इंकार करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं।”

[सं० एल-22012/156/83-डी-3(बी)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 19th July, 1984

S.O. 2740.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd. P.O. Ramakrishnapur, Distr. Adilabad (A.P.) the and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which M. N. Rao shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Messrs Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd. Ramakrishnapur Division II, P.O. Ramakrishnapur are justified in denying category IV wages to Sarvaswari Gajjala Kondaiah and Veladi Sambiah. General Mazdoors of R.K. 8 incline for their having functioned as Messs from July, 1981 onwards? If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?"

[No. L-22012(156)/83-D.III (B)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 1984

का० आ० 2741.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उपावद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कं० लि० लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन से संबंध है। औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच विद्यमान है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री आर्डी. पांडु रंगा राव होंगे, जिसका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कं० लि० लिमिटेड की कल्याणी-छाती-5 इन्क्लाइन में नियोजित कर्मचार, जो 1981 से ट्रेडर, कोल कटर, टिम्बरमैन, लाईन मैन, पंप खनारी और हॉलर खनारी के रूप में कार्य कर रहे थे, उनकी पदों पर स्थायी किये जाने के पात्र हैं? यदि हां, तो वे किस अनुसूची के इस्तेमाल हैं और किस श्रेणी से?"

[सं० एन-22011/12/84-डी-3(बी)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 21st July, 1984

S.O. 2741.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd. and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri I. Pandu Ranga Rao shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the workmen employed in Kalyankhau-5 Incline of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, who were acting as Trimmers, Coal Cutters, Timberman, Limemen, Pump Khalasis and Hauler Khalasis from 1981 are entitled to be confirmed against the same post? if so, to what relief are they entitled and from what date?"

[No. L-22011(12)/84-D.III(B)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 1984

का० आ० 2742.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उपावद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कं० लि० रामागुंडम डिवीजन-III के प्रबंधन से संबंध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री आर्डी. पांडु रंगा राव होंगे, जिसका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कं० लि० रामागुंडम डिवीजन-III का प्रबंधन श्री एन० राजेश, फिटर जी० डी० के०-7 अफ्रकटन की 1-2-1983 से सेवा में वर्द्धित करने में स्यात्विन है? यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मचार किस अनुसूची का इस्तेमाल करेंगे?"

[सं० एन-22012/22/84-डी-III(बी)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 1984

S.O. 2742.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers

in relation to the management of Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., Ramagundam Division III and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri I. Pandu Ranga Rao shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Messrs Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., Ramagundam Divn III, are justified in dismissing from service with effect from 1-2-83, Shri M. Rajaiah, Fitter, GDK-7 Incline? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

[No. L-22012/22/84-D.III.B]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 1984

का. आ. 2743.--केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसे से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में मैसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कं. लि., कोठागुडियम के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्याय-निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री आई. पान्दु रंगा राव होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्याय-निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या मैसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कं. लि., कोठागुडियम के प्रबंधन की वरिष्ठ लेखाकार, श्री ए. ईश्वररत्न को 31-5-84 से सेवा निवृत्त करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?"

[सं. एल-22012/161/83-डी-3(बी)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 20th July, 1984

S.O. 2743.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., Kothagudum and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri I. Pandu Ranga Rao shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

638 GI/84-10

siding Officer with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Messrs Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., Kothagudum are justified in retiring from service Shri A. Eswaraiah, Senior Accountant, w.e.f. 31-5-84? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

[No. L-22012/161/83-D.III(B)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 1984

का. आ. 2744.--केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में मैसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कं. लि. के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्याय-निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है, जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री आई. पान्दु रंगा राव होंगे जिनका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्याय-निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या मैसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड, रामाकृष्णपुर डिवीजन-I, डाकघर रामाकृष्णपुर, जिला-अदिलाबाद (आ० प्र०) के प्रबंधन की श्री एम. सत्यानारायण, कन्वेयर खसामी को लिपिक ग्रेड-2 के पद पर स्थायी न करने तथा उसे 4-12-82 से 30-5-83 की अवधि के लिए स्थापान्त भत्ते का भुगतान न करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?"

[संख्या एल-22012(13)/84-डी-3(बी)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 1984

S.O. 2744.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd. and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri I. Pandu Ranga Rao shall be the Presiding Officer with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Messrs Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., Ramakrishnapur Division-I, P.O. Ramakrishnapur, Distt. Adilabad

(A.P.) in not conforming Shri M. Satyanarayana, Conveyor Khalasi, in the post of Clerk Grade-II and also not paying him officiating allowance for the period from 4-12-82 to 30-5-83 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

[No. L-22012(12)/84-D.III(B)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 26 जुलाई 1984

का. प्रा. 2745.--केन्द्रीय सरकार को राय है कि इस से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कं० लि० के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठामीन अधिकारी श्री आई० पाण्डू रंगा राव होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्याय-निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या मंसर्स सिंगरेनी कोयलरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड, रामगुण्डम डिवीजन-4 डाकघर-गोदावरी खानी, जिला-करीमनगर (आ० प्र) का प्रबंधन, जी. डी० के० 8 इन्क्लाइन के कोल फिलर श्री जंगेरिया सुन्दर राजू को 24-10-1983 से सेवा से बर्खास्त करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित थी। यदि नहीं तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है।?"

[संख्या एल-22012/30/84-डी-3 (बी)]

नन्द लाल, अवर सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th July, 1984

S.O. 2745.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd. and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri I. Pandu Ranga Rao shall be Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Messrs Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd. Ramagundam Division IV, P.O. Godavrikhuni, Distt. Karimnagar (A.P.) were justified in dismissing from service with effect from 24-10-83, Shri Jangerala Sunder Raju Coal Filler, G.D.K. 8 Incline? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

[No. L-22012(30)/84-D.III(B)]

NAND LAL, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 8th August, 1984

S.O. 2746.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Bombay in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Chowgule & Company Limited, in relation to their Costi Iron Ore Mine and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 30th July, 1984.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-2/1 of 1984

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of M/s. Chowgule & Company Pvt. Ltd. in relation to their Costi Iron Ore Mine.

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri D. P. Sinha, Manager, Industrial Relations.

For the Workmen—Shri P. R. Krishnan, Vice-President, Chowgule Employees Union.

INDUSTRY : Iron Ore Mine STATE : Maharashtra.

AWARD

Bombay, dated the 16th July, 1984

By their Order No. L-26012(14)/83-D.III.B dated 28-12-1983 the following dispute has been referred for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act.

"Whether the penalty of dismissal awarded by M/s. Chowgule & Company Pvt. Ltd. to their workman Shri Laxman V. Gaonkar, Driver, Coste Mines is Commensurate with the act of misconduct committed by him? If not, to what relief the said workman is entitled?"

2. From the order of reference itself it is evident that what is to be determined is whether the punishment awarded is harsh or disproportionate or commensurate with the act of misconduct committed by the workman. The order of reference pre-opposes the commission of misconduct and therefore we cannot go behind the order to find out whether enquiry was essential or not and as such although an attempt was made to rely upon the Standing Orders for holding enquiry, the said attempt must fail.

3. By the statement of claim Ex. 10)W, besides other contentions which in the light of the observations above are irrelevant, the propriety of the order of dismissal has been also questioned in reply to which by Ex. 2/M and reply Ex. 11/M the said order has been supported on the ground of misconduct of the workman which resulted in loss or damage to the property of the company and also in death of one and injury to others. It is therefore urged by the company that looking to the gravity of the misconduct the order of dismissal passed is legitimate.

4. On the said pleadings the following issues arise for determination and my findings thereof are :—

ISSUES

FINDINGS

1. In view of the order of Reference can a question of legality and propriety of the order of dismissal be gone into? Yes propriety.
2. Was it incumbent on the management to hold an enquiry when the workman was admitting the guilt? No
3. If not enquiry was necessary, is not, the action of the management dismissing the employee justified? No

4. Did the said action amount to unfair labour practice? No
5. Was the punishment commensurate with the act of misconduct committed? No
6. If not, is the workman entitled to any relief? As per award.

5. We have already seen that the commission of the misconduct by the workman is patent from the order of reference itself, which order confers jurisdiction on this Tribunal and therefore the question whether enquiry was essential or not need not be gone into. Furthermore, even assuming that such a course of action was necessary in the light of replies annexure 'B', Ex. 4/M and annexure 'D', Ex. 7/M there is in no unclear terms the admission of the commission of misconduct namely allowing persons to travel in the company's vehicle, which vehicle met with an accident resulting in the death of one human being. When therefore there is this admission, it clearly absolves the management from holding any enquiry, for what was tried to be established namely the indictment of the commission of misconduct stood admitted on the part of the workman. Enquiry is necessary to probe in the matter in order to find out whether there is commission of misconduct or not, which probe is superfluous when there is an admission. What is therefore contended that it was incumbent on the part of the management to hold enquiry before passing the order of termination, carries no force.

6. However when the company relies upon the admission, what shall have to be seen is what is indictment as evidenced by the notice to show cause Ex. 3/M. When an admission has to be relied upon, the only ingredients which are appearing in the notice to show cause can only be relied upon and no extraneous matter can be taken. Not only that, but when there is notice to show cause and when there is admission, subsequently the company will not be allowed to say that it may be permitted to prove certain charges which might not have been included in the first notice to show cause. The notice to show cause would be the basis on which the whole case would depend and when there is admission, though the admission is in reply to notice to show cause it would be a guide in order to determine what is the nature of misconduct alleged to have been committed by the workman.

7. For the said purpose if we go to Ex. 3/W, the notice dated 11-8-1982 admittedly in the notice to show cause what we find is that "while going to Khandepar, you took 5 persons in Dual Cabin unauthorisedly and the same pick-up met with an accident at about 14.30 hours, causing death of one person and serious injuries to some others". The reading of this notice therefore reveals what was the charge that the Driver allowed five persons to travel in the company's vehicle but there was no indictment in the charge that the Driver acted dishonestly in the sense to pocket some money for giving lift to five persons. If any money would have been collected and had there been any such charge it would have been very serious misconduct on the part of the workman because in that case he would have acted dishonestly losing of the confidence of the management. The fact that no such charge is there therefore is pertinent to note. Another point to be noted is that though there is allegation of the accident, which resulted in death of one of the occupants and injuries to others, there is no allegation in the notice to show cause that the driver acted negligently. I have already pointed out that what is admitted had to be considered in the light of what was imputed and though there is averment of negligence subsequently in the Court that will have to be ignored in the light of Ex. 3/M. Till the matter was with the company, nowhere there was any allegation of negligence in driving on the part of Driver. Accident is one thing and accident on account of negligence is another thing. Therefore when we are considering the punishment, its propriety and other factors relating to the same, the fact that in the notice to show cause these two averments are conspicuously absent, will go a long way in determining the relevant facts.

8. At Ex. 4/M there is the plea of the workman in reply to notice to show cause dated 13-8-1982 where he has explained that when he started to Khandepar, it was heavily raining, on the way at Dharbonda he met four persons, who were of his acquaintance, who were going to Tisk out of four one small boy was completely drenched due to rain and at their request out of humanitarian consideration the Driver gave lift in the company's vehicle. He further says that a truck No. GDS 3565 was going ahead and he was following the same truck, then all of a sudden the Driver of the Truck stopped his vehicle where-upon had tried to swerve the vehicle, but all of a sudden one another truck came from frontside which he could not see clearly because of rain, he had to apply brake resulting in vehicle going to the right of the road in ditch. He also says that the road was slopy. Now as already stated in this plea of guilty there is no admission of either collecting money or acting negligently which when read with the notice to show cause which also does not impute such ingredients on the part of Driver, it means that the plea of guilty will have to be read as it is. We cannot add anything or subtract anything therefrom. Though I may not import criminal jurisprudence it is common knowledge that if the confession has to be relied upon the confession has to be read as a whole and not parts. It will not be allowed to say that a particular part be admitted and the rest may be ignored.

9. Two things are therefore evident that while allowing the persons to travel, not the money but humanitarian consideration weighed with the Driver. Another thing to be considered is that the accident was purely an accident, the factors like sudden stopping of front vehicle and sloping street/road contributing to the same but there is nothing on record to show that either the Driver was going with speed which became uncontrollable or he acted negligently in any other manner. In my view when we consider the order of reference in the light of these factors they are bound to weigh with the Tribunal considerably.

10. The fact that the Driver could not have allowed other persons to travel in the company's vehicle cannot be gain said for a moment, therefore he has committed misconduct. But what was the misconduct has to be seen. Under the Standing Orders disciplinary action for misconduct under order 18(1) warning censuring, fine etc. can be awarded when there is disregard or disobedience of orders, when the workman is guilty of carelessness or dangerous working and when there is insubordination. Naturally if the Driver flouted the orders of the company in allowing some outsiders to travel in the vehicle that would have amounted to disregard or disobedience of orders of the company. Similarly if there is an accident, even assuming that it was because of carelessness still it would come under Standing Order 18(1). Under standing order 18(2) the punishment of dismissal has been warranted. Under clause (e) causing loss or damage to company's property or property in its custody or premises has been made a ground of serious misconduct. I did not come across any other orders which would be relevant for this purpose. Causing loss or damage to company's property can be either intentionally or by negligently. Even assuming that the gravity of the conduct may come under clause 18(2)(e) and not 18(1)(g) still when the act is intentional the consequences are bound to be grave but not so when it is unintentional, much less when it is purely an accident. Therefore though the result was serious namely fatal injury to one and injuries to others and though from the Panchanama it seems the vehicle suffered a loss or damage of Rs. 20,000, for determining the propriety of the punishment the standing orders already referred to the initial indictment which is the basis of the whole thing and the admission of the workman which is treated as confession absolving the company from the responsibility of holding any enquiry, shall be material things. Now if it was purely an accident, though it resulted in death of one human being, the consideration would be different. Similarly if it was purely an accident, even if the company's vehicle suffered a loss of Rs. 20,000 still if no negligence was involved the consequences as already stated would be different. Furthermore, it is common knowledge that a vehicle before it goes on public road it should be insured and if any damage is suffered by the vehicle the owner of the vehicle has got a right to get compensation from the Insurance Company.

11. The reference in the light of order of reference would be governed by Section 11A of the Industrial Disputes Act which provision empowers the Tribunal in case it is satisfied that the order of discharge or dismissal was not justified, to set aside the order of discharge or dismissal and direct reinstatement of the workman on such terms and conditions, if any or give such other relief to the workmen including the award of any lesser punishment in lieu of discharge or dismissal.

12. In *Santak Singh Vs. 9th Industrial Tribunal*, 1984 LAB. I. C. 817 his Lordship of Calcutta High Court held that the management does not have unrestricted power of imposing any penalty or awarding the penalty of dismissal which cannot be interfered with by the Tribunal, if such penalty is on proper assessment found to be disproportionate or not commensurate with the proved misconduct. The proved misconduct is allowing outsiders to travel unauthorisedly in the company's vehicle and nothing else. It is not the case that in the past the workman indulged in such type of mischief and what was urged on behalf of the workman that his past record is unblemished there is no reason to disbelieve the same.

13. In *Sri Ganeshwar Aluminium Factory Vs. Industrial Tribunal, Madras*, 1982 (I) LLJ page 159 the Lordships of Madras High Court similarly held that there could be no doubt that even in a case where the Tribunal agrees with the management that the misconduct is proved, it may award a lesser punishment if it is of the opinion that he proved misconduct does not merit punishment by way of discharge or dismissal. In *Rama Kant Misra Vs. The State of U. P* 1982 (II), LLJ, page 472 the Lordships of Supreme Court held that in order to avoid the charge of vindictiveness, justice equity and fair play demand that punishment must always commensurate with the gravity of the offence charged. In the case before the Lordships there was use of abusive language and it was held that merely the use of such language on an occasion unconnected with subsequent positive action and not preceded by blameworthy conduct cannot permit an extreme penalty of dismissal from service. Their Lordships converted the punishment of dismissal into one of withholding of two increments with future effect. Similarly, in *Bhagat Ram Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh*, (1983) 2 Supreme Court cases 442 withholding of two increments and further order of reinstatement with 50 per cent of arrears from the date of termination, was held to be legitimate and proper order.

14. When an employee indulges in the act of dishonesty certainly the order of dismissal should be held to be proper. In *Gujarat State Road Transport Corporation Vs. Jamnadas Becharbhai*, 1983, Lab. I.C. 1349 when the Bus Conductor was found pocketing the bus fare collected from the passengers and thus had robbed the national Exchequer, the Lordships of Gujarat High Court held that the Labour Court would not be justified in ordering reinstatement of the conductor, but the case here as already detailed is far different. The company has never alleged either in the first notice to show cause or subsequently that the Driver had collected any fare from the occupants of the vehicle. It was therefore a result of humanitarian consideration on account of heavy rains and might be on account of persuasions of the persons concerned. There is therefore breach committed by the Driver no doubt in allowing the outsiders to travel in company's vehicle, yet the element of dishonesty is totally absent. Similarly as already discussed though the vehicle met with an accident there is nothing to show that it was on account of negligence of Driver. The accident was occurred in the year 1982 and Shri Singha on behalf of the company says that the police have lodged criminal action against the Driver and the said case is still pending. However whatever may be the result of criminal action by the Police, if we have to go by an admission in reply to notice to show cause, in the case before this Tribunal at least there is no element of negligent driving.

15. What remains in the light of the aforesaid reasons is that the Driver was guilty of allowing outsiders to travel in the company's vehicle without the permission of the company but nothing else. No doubt that the said action on the part of the Driver amounts to misconduct of flouting the

orders of the company, still the ultimate order passed namely severance of the relationship and dismissal would certainly be disproportionate. Once we arrive at this conclusion reinstatement will have to follow. However having regard to the fact that Panchanama discloses the damage at Rs. 20,000 to the vehicle, having regard to the fact that the action resulted in death of one human being, I feel that though there is an order of reinstatement, the arrears would not be full but 50 per cent as done in the case above referred to and further there would be stoppage of three increments with future effect. The stoppage of three increments will have a permanent effect. In my view the punishment awarded accordingly would be proper and would serve the ends of justice.

16. In the statement of claim there is allegation of unfair labour practice on the part of the company but the said allegation appears to have been made for allegation sake. When there was a misconduct as admitted by the workman the company was bound to take action although the action ultimately taken was found to be not commensurate with the act of misconduct. The charge of unfair labour practice is therefore baseless.

Award accordingly No order as to costs.

M. A. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer

[No. L-26012(14)/83-D.III(B)]

NAND LAL, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 16th August, 1984

S.O. 2747.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award under Section 33 A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 of the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad in the dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Godavarikhani, Ramagundam, Karimnagar Distt. and their workmen, which has been received by the Central Government on the 1st August, 1984.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL) AT HYDERABAD.

Miscellaneous Petition No. 38 of 1984.

IN

Industrial Dispute No. 11 of 1982.

BETWEEN

Challa Saraiah, Workman, Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., Godavari Khani, Karimnagar District. (A.P.)—Petitioner

AND

The Management of Singareni Collieries Company Ltd., Godavari Khani, Ramagundam, Karimnagar District (A.P.)—Respondent.

This petition coming for final hearing before me today in the presence of Sri G. Bilchappaiah, Advocate for the Petitioner-Workman and Sri K. Srinivasa Murthy, Miss G. Sudha and Sri Hemant Kumar saigai, Advocates for the Respondent Management and having stood over for consideration, the Court passed the following :

AWARD

This is a petition filed by the Petitioner under Section 33-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 praying for reinstatement with back wages and other benefits etc., He is the concerned workman in I.D. No. 11

of 1982 which is pending in this Court. On 20-7-1984 the Petitioner prayed that the petition is not pressed (vide endorsement on the petition). Hence dismissed. Now costs.

Award passed accordingly.

Given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 20th day of July, 1984.

SRI IMMANENI PANDURANGA RAO,
Presiding Officer

[No. L-22025/2/84-D.III(B)]

NAND LAL, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 17 जुलाई, 1984

का० आ० 2748.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में माला-प्रभा ग्रामीण बैंक के प्रबंधन से संबंध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्याय-निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री बी० एन० लालगे होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय बंगलूर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्याय-निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या मालाप्रभा ग्रामीण बैंक इम्प्लॉईज यूनियन, हुबली द्वारा मालाप्रभा ग्रामीण बैंक के कर्मचारों के संबंध में की गई यह मांग न्यायोचित है कि उन मामलों में, जिन्होंने बैंक में सेवा 1-9-1980 से पहले प्रारम्भ की है, मालाप्रभा ग्रामीण बैंक (कर्मचारी) सेवा विनियम, 1980 के विनियम 51 (1) के उपबंध के अनुसार संवेतन बीमारी छुट्टी देने के लिए अर्हकारी 5 वर्ष की सेवा-अवधि की गणना 1-9-1980 से न करके उनकी सेवा प्रारम्भ होने की तिथि से की जानी चाहिए? यदि हां, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार है?”

[संख्या एल-12011/1/84-डी-2 (ए)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 17th July, 1984

S.O. 2748.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employer in relation to the management of Malaprabha Grammeena Bank and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri B. N. Lalage shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Bangalore and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demand of Malaprabha Grammeena Bank Employees' Union, Hubli in relation to the workmen of Malaprabha Grammeena Bank that the qualifying period of 5 years' service for grant of sick leave on full emoluments in accordance with provision to Regulation 51(1) of Malaprabha Grammeena Bank (Staff) Service Regulations, 1980 should be reckoned, in case of those who joined Bank's service prior to 1st September, 1980 from the dates of their joining and not from 1st September, 1980 is justified? If so, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?”

[No. L-12011/1/84-D.II(A)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 1984

का० आ० 4749.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में तुंगभद्रा ग्रामीण बैंक, बेलरी के प्रबंधन से संबंध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्याय-निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री बी० एन० लालगे होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय बंगलूर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्याय-निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या तुंगभद्रा ग्रामीण बैंक, मुख्य कार्यालय बेलरी के प्रबंधन की अपनी तेलिगी शाखा, जिला—बेलरी के श्री आर० जयप्पा, अंशकालिक संदेगवाहक व जमादार की 18-7-1983 से सेवा समाप्त करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?”

[संख्या एल-12012/335/83 डी-II(ए)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 1984

S.O. 2749.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Tungabhadra Gramin Bank, Bellary and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the schedule hereto annexed;

And Whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10

of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri B. N. Lalage shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Bangalore and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Tungabhadra Gramm Gramseena Bank, Head Office, Bellary in relation to their Teligi Branch, Distt. Bellary in terminating the services of Shri R. Jayappa, Part-time-Messenger-cum-Sweeper with effect from 18-7-1983 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

[No. L-12012/335/83-D. II (A)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 26 जुलाई, 1984

का० आ० 2750.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाखण्ड अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में यूनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया, अहमदाबाद के प्रबंधतंत्र में सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्याय-निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (i) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री जी० एस० बरोत होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय अहमदाबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्याय-निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करता है।

अनुसूची

"क्या यूनाइटेड बैंक ऑफ इंडिया, बम्बई के प्रबंधतंत्र की अधीनस्थ कर्मचारी, श्री आर० एस० मकवाना को बैंक की नियमित सेवा में न खपाने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?"

[संख्या एल-12011/4/84-डी-2 (ए)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th July, 1984

S.O. 2750.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of United Bank of India, Ahmedabad, and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri G. S. Barot shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Ahmedabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of United Bank of India, Bombay in not absorbing Shri

R. S. Makwana, Sub-staff in Bank's regular service is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

[N. L-12011/4/84-D. II(A)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 27 जुलाई, 1984

का० आ० 2751.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाखण्ड अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में स्टेट बैंक ऑफ हैदराबाद, हैदराबाद के प्रबंधतंत्र में सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्याय-निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (i) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री आई० पांडू रंगा राय होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्याय-निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या स्टेट बैंक ऑफ हैदराबाद के प्रबंधतंत्र की अपनी शाखा उसमानी विश्वविद्यालय के अधीनस्थ कर्मचारी, श्री अहमद बिन ओमर को बैंक की सेवा में न खपाने और उसकी सेवाएं समाप्त करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?"

एन० के० बर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी
[संख्या-एल-12012/19/84-डी-2 (ए)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 27th July, 1984

S.O. 2751.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of Hyderabad, Hyderabad and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri I. Pandu Ranga Rao shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of Hyderabad in relation to their Osmani University Branch in not absorbing the Bank's services and terminating the services of Shri Ahmed Bin Omer, sub-staff is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

[No. L-12012/19/84-D.II(A)]

N K VFRMA, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 14th August, 1984

S.O. 2752.—In pursuance of section 17 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Bombay in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the State Bank of India, Madras and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 26-7-84.

BEFORE THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT BOMBAY

Reference No. NTB-3 of 1980

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to State Bank of India.

AND

Their workmen

APPEARANCES :

For the employer—Mr. Kaka, Advocate.

For the Union—No Appearance.

INDUSTRY : Banking **STATE :** Tamil Nadu

Bombay, the 20th day of June, 1984

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Shram Mantralaya, by order No. L-12011/2/80-D.II (A) dated 6th June, 1980 and as modified and amended under order No. L-12011/2/80-D.II (A) dated 26th July, 1980 and entrusting the case to Dr. Justice R. D. Tulpule, Presiding Officer vide Order No. L-12011/2/80-D.II (A) dated 31st January, 1984 in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7-B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) have referred to this National Tribunal for adjudication an industrial dispute between the employer State Bank of India and their workmen, in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule mentioned below :—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India in not taking into account Rs. 25 crores and Rs. 10 crores transferred from contingency to reserve fund during the years 1976 and 1977, for the purpose of computation of gross profits as required under Section 4 of the payment of Bonus Act for determining the quantum of bonus payable to the entitled employees for the accounting years ended on the 31st December, 1976 and 31st December, 1977 respectively is justified? If not, what relief are the employee concerned entitled to?"

2. Notices were issued to the parties that the hearing of the reference will take place on 20-6-1984. The notice was sent on 23-4-1984 and was received by the Union. State Bank Union thereafter applied for a long adjournment telegraphically and by letter dated 5-6-1984. They were informed that as the matter was old and the reference had been posted for hearing on earlier occasions long adjournment was unnecessary. This was on 11-6-1984. Even then the Union/Federation did not remain present and substantiate its demand. The demand is therefore rejected and reference answered accordingly. Award in terms reference dismissed.

R. D. TULPULE, Presiding Officer
[No. I-12011/2/80-D.II(A)]

N. K. VERMA, Desk Officer

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 1984

का. आ. 2753 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में उत्तरी रेलवे प्रशासन के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है,

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (i) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री महेन्द्र भूषण शर्मा होंगे, जिन का मुख्यालय जयपुर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या बीकानेर डिवीजन, उत्तरी रेलवे का रेलवे प्रशासन आई. ओ. डब्ल्यू. बीकानेर के अधीन श्री राम सिंह पुत्र प्रेम राज माली की 11-6-1983 से सेवाएं समाप्त करने में न्यायोचित हैं? यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?"

[मं. एल-41012/64/83-सी-2 (बो)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 21st July, 1984

S.O. 2753.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Northern Railway Administration and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri Mahendra Bhushan Sharma shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Jaipur and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the Railway Administration of Bikaner Division-Northern Railway is justified in terminating the services of Shri Ram Singh S/o Premraj Mali under the IOW Bikaner with effect from 11-6-1983? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

[No. I-41012(64)/83-D. II(B)]

का. आ. 2754 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में पश्चिमी रेलवे, कोटा के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (i) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री महेन्द्र भूषण शर्मा होंगे, जिनको

मुख्यालय जयपुर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या पश्चिमी रेलवे प्रशासन की गंगापूर शहर के लॉको शेड में नियोजित वरिष्ठ लिपिक, श्री राधा रमन शर्मा की छः मास की वेतन-वृद्धि रोकने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?”

[सं. एल-41011/69/83-डो-2 (बी)]

ORDER

S.O. 2754.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Western Railway, Kota and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri Mahendra Bhushan Sharma shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Jaipur and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the Western Railway Administration is withholding increments of Shri Radha Raman Sharma, Senior Clerk employed in Loco Shed, Gangapur City for a period of six months is justified? If not to what relief is the workman entitled?”

[No. L-41011(69)/83-D. II(B)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 1984

का. आ. 2755.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में दक्षिणी रेलवे, मद्रास के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (i) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री के. एस. गुरुमूर्ती होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय मद्रास में होगा और अन्य विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या अखिल भारतीय स्टेशन मास्टर्स एसोसिएशन की सिली हुई बर्दी, जो कि इस समय स्टेशन मास्टर्स/सहायक स्टेशन मास्टर्स को दी जा रही है, के स्थान पर

कपड़ा तथा सिलाई के दाम या बर्दी भत्ते की मांग न्यायोचित है? यदि हाँ, तो कपड़े तथा सिलाई के दाम या बर्दी भत्ता दिए जाने की क्या राशि होनी चाहिए?”

[संख्या-एल-41011/8/84-डो-II(बी)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 1984

S.O. 2755.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Southern Railway, Madras and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri K. S. Gurumurthy shall be the Presiding Officer with headquarters at Madras and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the All India Station Masters Association is justified in demanding cloth and stitching charges or a uniform allowance in lieu of stitched uniforms which are presently being supplied to SMs/ASMs? If so, what should be the amount of cloth and stitching charges or uniforms allowance to be provided?”

[No. L-41011/8/84-D.II (B)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 25 जुलाई, 1984

का. आ. 2756.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में पश्चिमी रेलवे प्रशासन के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विद्यमान है; और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (i) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करके हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री महेन्द्र भूषण शर्मा होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय जयपुर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या रेलवे प्रशासन श्री आर. पी. त्रहन को 24-7-79 से मुख्य लिपिक के रूप में पदोन्नत करने से इनकार करने में न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?”

“क्या रेलवे प्रशासन, श्री आर. एस. जैन को 13-7-79 से ग्रेड-III ड्रेसर के रूप में पद-अवनत करने में न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?”

“क्या रेलवे प्रशासन, श्री एस. एल. शर्मा को 16-6-61 से कनिष्ठ तकमानवीस के रूप में प्रोफार्मा पदोन्नति पर वरिष्ठता देने से हटकार करने में न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?”

[संख्या एल-41011/73/83-डी-II(बी)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 25th July, 1984

S.O. 2756.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Western Railway Administration, and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri Mahendra Bhushan Sharma shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Jaipur and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the Railway Administration is justified in denying promotion to Shri O. P. Trahan as Head Clerk w.e.f. 24-7-79 ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled ?”

“Whether the Railway Administration is justified in reverting Shri R. S. Jain as Grade III Dresser w.e.f. 13-7-79 ? If not to what relief the workman is entitled ?”

“Whether the Railway Administration is justified in denying the seniority as consequent upon proforma promotion to Shri S. L. Sharma as Jr. Draftsman w.e.f. 16-6-61 ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled ?”

[No. L-41011(73)/83-D.II (B)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 26 जुलाई, 1984

का. भा. 2757.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में पश्चिमी रेलवे प्रशासन के प्रबंध तंत्र से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विद्यमान है—

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (i) के खड्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री महेन्द्र अषण शर्मा होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय जयपुर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या रेलवे प्रबंध तंत्र द्वारा पाइप फिटर, श्री डी. पूरन से कनिष्ठ कर्मचारी, श्री मांजीलाल को सरजीह देकर 638 GI/84—11.

उच्च वेतन मान की वक़ाया राशि का दिया जाना न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?”

[संख्या एल-41011/62/83-डी-II (बी)]

टी० बी० सीतारामन, अव्वर सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi the 26th July, 1984

S.O. 2757.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Western Railway Administration and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri Mahendra Bhushan Sharma shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Jaipur and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the arrears of high scale paid by the railway management to Shri Mangilal a Junior employee in preference to Shri D. Pooran, Pipe fitter is justified ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled ?”

[No. L-41011/62/83-D.II (B)]

New Delhi, the 7th August, 1984

S.O. 2758.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Cantonment Board, Ambala and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 27th July, 1984.

BEFORE SHRI I. P. VASISHTH, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,

CHANDIGARH

I.D. No. 78/83 (N. Delhi) 37/83 (CHD)

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Cantonment Board, Ambala.

AND

Their Workman—Kiroori Mal.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri S. C. Bhatnagar.

For the Workman—Shri Rajeshwar Nath.

CANTONMENT BOARD : Ambala STATE : Haryana.

AWARD

Dated the 23rd of July, 1984

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947, hereinafter referred to as the Act, per their No. L-13012(2)/78-D.II(B) dated the 8th of May, 1980 read with S.O. No. S-11025(2)/83 dated the 8th of June 1983 referred the following Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

“Whether the action of the Management of Cantt. Board, Ambala Cantt., in not, giving chance to Shri Kiroori Mal Ex-Accountant of the Cantt. Board, for the post of Accountant in preference to one Shri Madan Lal Chawla, Asstt. of the Cantt. Board, in the month of August 1977; in view of the past long

services of Shri Kicori Mal as Accountant in the Cantt. Board; is justified? if not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. Brief facts of the case according to the petitioner/workman are that he was serving the Respd't./Board in various capacities since 10-3-1948 and was promoted to the rank of an Accountant/Supdt., w.e.f. 3-10-1971. He averred that in February 1977 when he was working as an Accountant, due to excision of certain areas from the Cantt. Board to the erstwhile Notified Area Committee Ambala (since upgraded into a regular Municipal Committee) his services were transferred to the above said N.A.C. w.e.f. 5-2-1977 and he was informed that in case he was not willing to accept the transfer his services with the Board shall stand terminated. Forced by the circumstances the petitioner accepted the transfer even though it adversely effected his service conditions. It was further pleaded that in Aug. 1977 the Respd't. Board created certain equivalent posts and as they proposed to fill up the same, he also applied for consideration by moving them through proper channel, but they did not consider his case and rather promoted one Madan Lal Chawla even though the latter was junior to him.

3. The petitioner complained that his forced transfer to the N.A.C. tantamounted to retrenchment for which no monetary benefits were accorded to him and that by declining to consider his re-absorption against an equivalent post the Respd't. Board violated the provisions of Section 25-H also. Accordingly he raised a demand for being appointed to the post of an Accountant or its equivalent rank and since the Board did not respond favourably despite the intervention of the Conciliation machinery hence the Reference.

4. Resisting the proceedings, the Respd't. Board denied that there was any element of retrenchment in the transfer of petitioner's service to the N.A.C. so as to entitle him for any retrenchment benefits including those envisaged in Section 25-H of the Act. All the same the averments of fact raised by the petitioner were not disputed but it was vehemently denied that there was any animus in their action or that the petitioner had suffered any prejudice in his service conditions on account of the impugned transfer. For the obvious reasons they questioned the validity of the Reference because according to them, petitioner's transfer was ordered under the instruction of the Govt. of India when certain area was excised from their jurisdiction in favour of the Notified Area Committee.

5. Since the pleadings of the parties were found fully covered under the terms of Reference, therefore, under the orders of my learned predecessor they were called upon to adduce evidence in support of their respective pleadings. Thus the petitioner examined himself whereas the Respd't. Board produced their Office Supdt. Shri Jagan Nath, of course both the parties also relied on a number of documents of the admitted nature which have carefully perused and heard them at length.

6. On behalf of the Respondent Board it was argued that the entire effort of the petitioner was misconceived in the sense that he wanted to be absorbed in the post of an Accountant (offered to Shri Madan Lal Chawla) on the assumption that he was one of their retrenched employee, whereas as a matter of fact, his services were never terminated rather the same were permanently placed at the disposal of the Government of India under their own instructions. The learned counsel thus contended that since the petitioner's transfer took place as an operation of law, therefore, he could not grumble against it and otherwise also he was estopped from doing so because he had voluntarily accepted the transfer, which did not prejudice his service conditions in any manner whatsoever.

7. In spite of seeming attraction, the submissions of the Ld. counsel failed to carry conviction with me. For the proper appreciation of the point in issue, it would be in the fitness of things to have a sequence-wise glance into the facts of the case. To be precise, Ex. R1 is the original order of transfer placing the petitioner's services at the disposal of N.A.C. on excision of certain area from the jurisdiction of the Respondent Board. Even though it ensured protection of his pay yet no assurance was given regarding any of the remaining service conditions, rather the closing part of its para No. 1 was equally emphatic to inform him that in case

would be deemed to have been terminated on payment of such terminal benefits as envisaged under the rules. It clearly shows that there was a threat to do away with his service in case he had any reservation against his transfer. In his deposition before this Tribunal the petitioner categorically complained that he had practically no choice in the matter because otherwise he stood on the road. Therefore, to raise the bar of estoppel against him on the ground of his being a consenting party to the transfer would be nothing short of a grave travesty of truth.

8. As regards the service conditions, less said the better because barring the protection of his salary the petitioner was not assured any other parity. On the other hand, the Respondent's own Office Supdt. Shri Jagan Nath conceded in his cross-examination that the employees of the Cantonment Board were entitled for the benefit of gratuity and pension which are not available to the employees of a Notified Area Committee. Thus, on the face of it the impugned transfer was violative of clause (b) to the proviso of Section 25 FF of the Act and, as such, it tantamounted to retrenchment. For my views I draw support from the observations in the matter of Management of Ambala Cantt. Electricity Corporation Vs. Its Workmen AIR 1971 Punjab & Haryana 274.

9. As a natural consequence of my abovesaid discussion it follows that the petitioner had an inherent right for consideration to the post of the Accountant, sought to filled up by the Board in August, 1977. On behalf of the Board it was argued that according to the petitioner's own admission there were two other persons who were holding equivalent posts at the time of his transfer; that both of them were senior to him and that their services were also transferred to the N.A.C. alongwith him. The learned counsel contended that in their presence no preferential treatment could be given to the petitioner for filling up the post.

10. I am not impressed with the logic since the learned counsel appears to have lost sight of the fact that there is no available evidence to show that either of those two persons had even applied for the post; and obviously the Board could not ignore the claim of the petitioner when his colleagues did not want to compete with him. It is besides the point that according to the unrebutted statement of the petitioner, atleast one of them viz. Des Raj had already raised an Industrial dispute and sought a regular reference under I.D. Act on the point of his transfer, whereas the other workman has since retired on attaining the age of superannuation.

11. In the same sequence it may also be worthwhile to note that despite the petitioner's transfer to the N.A.C. there was no withdrawal or abrogation of the post by the Board. On the other hand they passed Resolution No. 1 of 28th July, 1977 to fill up all the three posts falling vacant on the aforesaid transfers and that was how that per Resolution No. 2 dated 31st August, 1977 Shri Madan Lal Chawla was promoted from the junior ranks. Actually the Respd't.'s Office Supdt. Jagan Nath admitted that in due course of time all these vacancies were filled up by giving promotions to the seniormost amongst the junior employees.

12. In other words it may be said that the Respd't. Board had almost forced the transfer on the petitioner/Workman and his colleagues to the N.A.C. without caring to seek a guarantee from the latter to protect their service conditions; they rather put up a deaf ear to the petitioner's entreaties for consideration against an equivalent post despite its availability and their statutory obligation.

13. On behalf of the workman it was argued that since the Respd't. Board acted illegally in promoting Shri Madan Lal Chawla against the relevant post from August, 1977, therefore, by a legal fiction it may be assumed that the petitioner was appointed against that post and as such was also entitled for the arrears of salary.

14. I am not impressed with the effort because it is based on the assumption that Section 25H 'per se' confers a right of appointment. On the other hand its scope is limited to the extent of preferential consideration in the matter of re-employment. It may also be worthwhile to note that according to the common case of the parties a post of Accountant is still lying vacant with the Respd't. Board as per disclosures by their Office Supdt. Shri Jagan Nath in the closing part of his cross-examination.

15. Thus to sum up my aforesaid discussion on the limited aspects of the issue, as emerging from the records and the points raised before me, I answer the reference in favour of the petitioner and return my Award with a direction to the Respdt. Board to forthwith consider his application for appointment to the post of an Accountant and deal with it in accordance to law i.e. within the frame work of Section 25-H of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Chandigarh.

I. P. VASISHTH, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-13012(2)/78-D.II(B)]

New Delhi, the 9th August, 1984

S.O. 2759.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Chandigarh in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Cantonment Board, Ambala and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 4th August, 1984.

BEFORE SHRI I. P. VASISHTH, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
CHANDIGARH

Case No. I. D. 135[83 (N. Delhi); 3 of 1983 (CHD)

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Management of Cantonment Board Ambala Cantt.

AND

Their Workmen : Shri Bimal Chander Sharma.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri S. C. Bhatnagar.

For the Workman—Shri Rajeshwar Nath.

ACTIVITY CANTONMENT BOARD AMBALA
STATE—HARYANA.

AWARD

Dated, the 31st July, 1984

The Central Govt., Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947, hereinafter referred to as the Act, per their Order No. L-13012(5)/81-D.II.B. dated the 11th of January, 1982, read with S.O. No. S-11025 (2)/83 dated the 8th of June, 1983 referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

“Whether the action of the employer in relation to the Cantonment Board, Ambala Cantonment in not promoting Shri Bimal Chander Sharma Assistant, to the post of Superintendent, while juniors to him have been promoted, is justified? If not, to what relief Sh. Sharma is entitled and from what date?”

2. Brief facts of the case, according to the petitioner/workman, are that he was in the service of Respondent Board since July 1943 and was compulsory retired on 29-7-1977 without any show cause notice. However, in exercise of his powers under section 52 of the Cantonments Act 1924 the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief Western Command set aside that order and thus the petitioner was reinstated w.e.f. 29-11-1979 per resolution No. 5 dated 27-11-1979 passed by the Board. It was revealed that during the intervening period his juniors; Sarvshri Jagan Nath, Banarsi Lal and Madan Lal Chawla, were promoted from the Assistant cadre to the next higher grade of Supdt. w.e.f. 2-9-1977 in pursuance to special resolution No. 2 dated 3-8-1977 adopted by the Respondent Board; obviously the petitioner was not considered for promotion because at that time he was already out of job, as stated hereinbefore. But on his un-

qualified re-instatement w.e.f. 29-11-1979 under the directions of the Commanding Officer, he became entitled for all the attendant-service benefits and so he impressed upon the Respdt. Board to grant him the promotional privilege also since three of his juniors had already been placed in the higher grade and were still working there in officiating capacity.

3. Since the Respondent Board did not respond favourably to the petitioner's demand despite the intervention of the A.L.C.(C) hence the Reference.

4. Resisting the proceedings, the Respdt. Board denied the charge of any impropriety in their action and averred that the reference was premature because the question of petitioner's seniority vis-a-vis a number of his colleagues, including those recently promoted to the Supdt. level, was already under their consideration and without determining the same it was not deemed desirable to disturb the existing arrangement. The Board also doubted the jurisdiction of the Tribunal to deal with a matter of promotion in the reference proceedings.

5. All the same, the averments of fact raised, by the petitioner, were not challenged. To be precise it was conceded that the petitioner's compulsory retirement was set aside by the Commanding Officer and by the time of his re-instatement, S/Sh. Jagan Nath, Banarsi Lal and Madan Lal Chawla were promoted to the next higher grade of Supdt. It is besides the point that according to the Board all these 3 persons were working against substantive/permanent posts whereas the Commanding Officer had meanwhile passed an interim order on 11-4-1983 declaring that the period of petitioner's absence from duty w.e.f. 27-7-1977 to 28-11-1979 was to be treated as “dies non” and, thus, a show cause notice had been issued to the parties calling upon them to explain to why it should not be made absolute.

6. The parties were taken to trial on the following issues framed over and above the terms of reference.

(i) Whether the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain and decide the dispute? O.P.R.

(ii) Whether the Reference is premature?

7. In support of their respective versions both the parties relied upon a number of documents; of course all of the admitted nature; and the petitioner examined himself as a witness whereas the board produced their Office Supdt. Jagan Nath.

8. Be that as it may, I have carefully perused the entire available data and heard the parties at length. My issue-wise discussion and findings are as follows :

Issue No. 1

9. The Learned counsel for the Respondent-Board contended that the question of petitioner's promotion was beyond the perview of this Tribunal and, as such, the reference was liable to be rejected in limine.

10. In my considered opinion the submission requires summary rejection because the definition of an “industrial dispute”, as laid down in section 2(k) of the Act is comprehensive enough to include any difference between an Employer and employee on the point of latter's service conditions, and certainly promotional avenues are also covered thereunder. Accordingly, I answer the issue against the Board.

Issue No.2.

11. On behalf of the Respondent it was argued that since they were already seized of the petitioner's representation for promotion, therefore, the reference was premature till the rejection of his prayer. In the same sequence it was submitted that according to the common case of the parties the Commanding Officer had declared the period intervening between the petitioner's compulsory retirement and re-instatement as “dies non” and issued a show cause notice to the parties as to why the said order may not be made absolute; and therefore till the vacation of that notice it would not be a prudent proposition to decide the petitioner's claim because in the event of confirmation of the said order, his very eligibility would fall to the ground.

12. Despite seeming attraction the submission of the learned counsel failed to carry conviction with me, the pertinent point is that on their own admission the Board re-instated the petitioner to his Original post w.e.f. 29-11-1979 in compliance of the directions of the Commanding Officer dated 19-7-1978 issued under section 52 of the Cantonments Act. To be precise, it was a case of re-instatement rather than re-employment; meaning thereby that within the frame work of FR-54 and 54A there was a deemed proposition of continuity in service, more so when the relevant order of the Commanding Officer did not give any indication to the contrary. Of course, per his order Exb. M-2 dated 11th April, 1983, he declared the intervening period as "dies-non" and called upon the parties to show cause as to why it should not be made absolute; but a bare perusal of the said order should leave no manner of doubt that it was issued for the limited purpose of curtailing the petitioner's entitlement to the back-wages, otherwise the continuity of his service was not doubted even obliquely. It is besides the point that the said order was passed by the Commanding Officer "suo-moto", as if he had the powers to Review his own orders even though there is no warrant for such an assumption within the province of the Cantonments Act.

13. It, thus, follows that there was no disturbance in the petitioner's pre-existing seniority as determined in the year 1964 per Board's circular Exb. W-6; and it goes without saying that according to this document the petitioner was the senior most amongst the claimants to the post of Supdts. given to some of his colleagues during the intervening period of his compulsory retirement and re-instatement.

14. Similarly the Board's contention that the reference proceedings are pre-mature because they are already seized of the respective claims of the employees on the point of seniority and cannot consider the petitioner's case before determining the same is also devoid of force. It may be worthwhile to note that his representation for promotion was pending with them since 24th January, 1980 as should be evident from the copy of resolution No. 13 dated 28th June, 1982 filed by the Board itself, moreover from resolution No. 36 dated 24th January, 1980 it would further appear that right from the said date the Board was sitting over the question of finalising the seniority list and no decision has so far been concluded by them. Despite my persistence query raised during the course of arguments, no plausible explanation could be built up as to, then why the earlier settled seniority list of the year 1964 was not being implemented, during the meanwhile. After all attaining a particular seniority is a sort of employee's asset of which he cannot be deprived in the absence of some compelling reasons, and simply because a few of his colleagues started disputing his entitlement to promotion after his re-instatement his entire career could not be jeopardized. Moreover we cannot lose sight of the fact that during this intervening period of 16 years i.e. the year 1964 when the seniority was finalized and the year 1980 when the petitioner claimed promotion on his reinstatement, nobody had ever raised any objection against it.

15. Thus to conclude with my aforesaid discussion, I over rule the Board's objection against the maintainability of the reference and as such answer the issue against them.

Reference and Relief

16. As a natural consequence of my above noted discussion and findings on the various aspects of the matter, as emerging from the records and the points raised before me, on sustaining the petitioner's view point, in its pith and substance, I return my Award against the respondent-Board with a direction to them to forthwith consider his case for promotion to the supernumary post of Superintendent on the basis of his seniority determined in the year 1964 per circular Exb. W. 6

Chandigarh,
31st July, 1984.

I. P. VASISHTH, Presiding Officer
[No. L-13012(5)/81-D.II(B)]

New Delhi, the 10th August, 1984

S.O. 2760.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Govern-

ment Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Bombay in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of International Airport Authority of India and the Directorate General, Civil Aviation, Department, New Delhi and their workman which was received by the Central Government on the 4th August, 1984.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2 BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-2/4 of 1983

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Management of International Airport Authority of India and the Directorate General, Civil Aviation Department, New Delhi.

AND

Their Workman

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers.—Shri N. R. Mane, Advocate, for Director General of Civil Aviation, Shri M. V. Kini, Advocate, for International Airports Authority of India.

For the Workman.—Shri J. C. Gadkari, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Aviation.

STATE : Maharashtra.

Bombay, the 17th July, 1984

AWARD

(Dictated in the open Court)

By order No. L-11012(1)/82-D.IV(A) dated 20-1-1983 the following dispute has been referred for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act :—

"Whether the action of the Director General, Civil Aviation Department, New Delhi in terminating the services of Shri N. M. Shetty, ex-ticket clerk employed at Airport, Santacruz, under the International Airport Authority of India, Bombay, is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

The question involved is the justifiability or otherwise of the termination of services of Shri N.M. Shetty, ex-ticket clerk employed at Santacruz Airport by an order dated 19-12-1977 passed by the Deputy Director General, Civil Aviation Department, New Delhi.

2. Before passing of the said order there was an enquiry held under the orders of International Air-Ports Authority of India since at the said time the employee was serving as Ticket Clerk under the said authority. Since the enquiry as well as the resultant order passed after the alleged repatriation to the parent department, have been challenged, those questions are bound to arise in the present case. In support of this contention challenging the various orders the employee has failed statement of claim Ex. 2/W whereby after narrating the history from the time of appointment on 20-12-1969, he refers to the incident dated 19-11-1973 which occurred in the night of 18th and 19th November, 1973 during which time he was on duty at counter No. 3. It is alleged that the International Airports Authority of India being the Employer and the said authority being an independent body, having its own rules and regulations, the order of removal of dismissal passed by the Deputy Director General, Civil Aviation Department was without any authority and therefore is illegal and non est. It is further alleged that when Shri S. P. Boricha jointly tried with Shri Shetty during the very enquiry was exonerated from the charge of selling of ticket to Shri Shetty, the adverse finding noted against the latter, holding the misconduct as alleged proved was preverse and without support of any evidence. It is further urged that the counterfoils of tickets which were seized at the time of incident though there was a demand to that effect were never produced before the enquiry Officer

thus rendering the management guilty of suppressing Muddamal property. Similarly it is further urged that the log-book which was a material evidence after production was found tampered with during the course of enquiry thus rendering the same infructuous. According to the employee the initial entry in the log book indicates the time a 22.45 hours which was found subsequently corrected as 23.45 hours. According to him the time factor was very vital because most of the tickets which were alleged to have been sold could not have been sold at the relevant time. It is further complained that the seizer was not effected under Panchanama as was required to be done tendering it illegal. The enquiry is stated to be not fair and just but mala fide and arbitrary and therefore the findings are perverse and ineffective. In this way the enquiry as well as the resultant order of termination have been challenged on material ground.

The Civil Aviation Department has filed their written statement at Ex. 3/M-1 whereby all these contentions have been refuted and it is urged that in the first place since the Civil Aviation Department in whose service Shri Shetty was, is not an industry but a non-commercial Department of the Central Government, the reference itself becomes untenable. It is urged that the services of Shri Shetty were lent to the International Airports Authority who was sent on deputation and that subsequently he was repatriated to the parent department since when he was in the service there. Regarding the enquiry it is contention of the department it was a regular departmental enquiry held according to the rules and that thereafter the employee stood repatriated to the parent department thereafter after going through the enquiry papers and findings of the Enquiry Officer, the Deputy Director General, who is the appointing authority and therefore also disciplinary authority issued notice to show cause dated 22-6-1977 and then passed the final order removing him from service to be effective from 19-12-1977.

4. The contention that Shri Shetty was on deputation as raised by the Civil Aviation Department finds support from the written statement filed by the Respondent No. 2 namely the International Airports Authority of India who also supports the termination of service by the competent person.

5. On the above pleadings the following issues arise for determination and my findings thereon are :—

Issue	Findings
1	2
1. Whether Civil Aviation Department is an industry ?	No
2. If yes what was the status of Shri N.M. Shetty at the time of the alleged termination? Was he a workman or not	Not a workman
2A. Whether Shri Shetty was governed by Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules 1965?	Yes being in the service of Civil Aviation Department.
3. In whose employment Shri N.M. Shetty was ? Whether of Civil Aviation Department or of International Airports Authority of India, at the time of termination of his service ?	Civil Aviation Department.
4. Is the dispute not governed by the Industrial Disputes Act ?	No
5. Whether the findings of the Enquiry Officer were perverse ?	No
6. Whether the enquiry was unfair, unjust, mala fide and arbitrary?	No
7. Whether the findings arrived at were not proper for reasons stated in the statement of claim?	No, they were proper

1	2
8. Whether the order of termination was passed by an authority not competent to pass it?	Was passed by competent authority
8A. Whether the order of reversion of Shri N.M. Shetty passed by Airports Authority of India was illegal ab initio?	No
9. Whether Deputy Director General of Civil Aviation Department was not competent to pass the same?	Yes
10. Was the severance of relationship validly effected?	Yes
11. Whether the order of termination was legal and justified?	Yes
12. Whether the order of punishment was proper or harsh?	Proper
13. If the order of termination is found to be not legal or not justified, to what relief or reliefs the workman is entitled?	Nil

REASONS

6. Under Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act a workman is defined as any person employed in any industry to do any skilled or unskilled manual, supervisory, technical or clerical work for hire or reward and it is evident that before any employee can seek remedy which in its turn would depend whether he is employed in any industry or not. Consequently, the question in whose service Shri Shetty was and continued to be assumes great importance because what is urged on behalf of the opponents is that the Civil Aviation Department in whose service the employee was at the time of final order is not an industry and therefore the relevant provisions have no application. The fact that the International Airports Authority of India is an industry is not challenged and therefore if there is reason to believe that the workman was in the service of the said authority automatically he would be governed by the definition of workman but otherwise not. Before therefore averting to the question whether Civil Aviation Department in fact is an industry or not, it becomes essential to see as to in whose service Shri Shetty was at the relevant time. Initially, it is an admitted fact, that Shri Shetty was employed by the Civil Aviation Department and he says that this was since 1900 which there is no reason to disbelieve. However by order dated 13-4-1972 along with some other Ticket Clerks, in all 40 in number, Shri N. M. Shetty was sent on deputation on the same terms and conditions of service to the International Airports Authority of India. The said authority has been established under an Act known as International Airports Authority Act, 1971 (43 of 1971) and under Section 12 thereof especially sub-section 1(f), every employee holding any office under the Central Government immediately before the relevant day shall be treated as on deputation, with the authority and shall hold his office in the Authority by the same tenure and upon the same terms and conditions of service as respects remuneration, leave, provident fund, etc.

7. We further find from document Appendix (d) in Folder No. 6 that while in the service with the said authority the employee elected revised pay-rules with effect from 1-1-1973 and accordingly along with other employees his pay stood revised.

8. Till this point of time, there stands no controversy but the controversial topic starts from the alleged order of repatriation dated 14-5-1976. On the said day as per the document (e) in Folder No. 6, the Director of International Airports Authority of India informed Shri N. M. Shetty that he stood reverted to the parent department with immediate effect and he was further told that he may therefore report to the Regional Director Civil Aviation Department, Bombay Region for further instructions. Now evi

dently this was after the report of the Enquiry Officer. What is urged on behalf of Shri Shetty is that under Section 12(1)(f) it is the Central Government who either on its own notion or at the request of the Authority, can recall such employee to its service and it is therefore urged that the Central Government having never recalled Shri Shetty, his service shall be deemed to have been absorbed in the service of the International Airports Authority of India and as such despite the order dated 14-5-1976 the relationship of employer and employee between Shri Shetty and on one hand and International Airports Authority on the other shall continue and therefore he no longer can be said to be in the service of the Civil Aviation Department. Now it is true that so far as the provisions of Section 12(1)(f) are concerned they speak of recalling by the Central Government but in this regard one factor is important that the Central Government as the provisions stand never gave up their hold on the employee. There is vast difference between transfer and sending somebody on deputation and under Section 12(1)(f) we find that there are three stages namely, deputation, recalling or absorption. After the absorption by the Airports Authority, the relationship which existed between the Central Government and the employee shall cease but it is nobody's case that Shri Shetty was absorbed by the Airports Authority and on the contrary as already pointed out they were eager to send him back and took action to that effect. Naturally if the provisions speak of recalling, still the rule of deputation would continue meaning thereby that the parent department as well as the department to who services he was deputed either could recall an employee or could send him back depending on which department takes the notion.

9. Furthermore from the conduct of the authorities of the Civil Aviation Department who issued the notice to show cause and ultimately passed the order of removal and before whom an attempt was made to file appeal which failed, there is every reason to hold that the action of Airports Authority to send Shri Shetty back to the Civil Aviation Department received full approval of the Civil Aviation Department authorities and once it is held that it was not a transfer permanently but on deputation and it is further held that on sending him back by the Air-Ports authority the employee was received by the Civil Aviation Department, who took requisite steps. No other conclusion is possible then to hold that the relationship which continued even during the time of deputation, never was severed. Assuming that the deputation had created certain bar still on receiving him back to the parent department whatever doubt was there stood removed and Shri Shetty became a fullfledged employee of the Civil Aviation Department.

10. Once we arrive at this conclusion immediately the next question which poses for determination would be whether the Civil Aviation Department is an industry or not. Unless we are in a position to hold accordingly Shri Shetty can never gain the status of workman without which he cannot have access to the various remedies under the Industrial Disputes Act. Now the term industry has been defined in Section 2(j) of the Industrial Disputes Act where it means any business, trade, undertaking, manufacture or calling of employers and includes any calling, service, employment, handicraft or industrial occupation or a vocation of workmen.

11. The test whether a particular department of Government or the public undertaking is an industry or not has been now laid down in what is known as Bangalore Water Supply & Sewerage Board Vs. A. Rajappa and others reported in 1978 (I), LLJ, page 349. It has been held therein.—

"I (a) Where (i) Systematic activity; (ii) organised by co-operation between employer and employee (the direct and substantial element is commercial); (iii) for the production and/or distribution of goods and services calculated to satisfy human wants and wishes (not spiritual or religious but inclusive of material things or services geared to celestial bliss) i.e. making on a large-scale of (prasad or food) prima facie, there is an industry in that enterprise.

(b) Absence of profit-motive or gainful objective is irrelevant, be the venture in the public, joint or private or other sector.

(c) The true focus is functional and the decisive test is the nature of the activity with special emphasis on the employer-employee relations.

(d) If the organisation is a trade or business, it does not cease to be one because of philanthropy animating the undertaking."

In the same case it was further held that sovereign functions strictly understood alone qualify for exemption, not the welfare activities or economic adventures undertaken by Government or statutory bodies. It was further held even in departments discharging sovereign functions, if there are units which are industries and they are substantially servable, than they can be considered to come within S.2(j). While laying down dominant nature test the Lordships of Supreme Court further observed that where complex activities are carried on, some of which may qualify for exemption, others not, involves employees of the total undertaking, the predominant nature of the services and the integrated nature of the departments as explained in the Nagpur Corporation case will be the true test. Keeping these various tests in view, if we turn to the business transacted by the department namely the Civil Aviation Department we find that the said department deal with various activities which are enumerated at page 54 of the book called Allocation of Business Rules, 1961 published by the Government of India. Now this department appears to be an amalgum of Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism, yet since we are concerned with the Civil Aviation department in whose service Shri Shetty was reference to the activities of Ministry of Tourism which are enumerated there would be irrelevant and therefore redundant. The activities of Civil Aviation Department as stated are as follows:—

1. Meteorological Organisation.
2. Aircraft and air navigation; Provision of Aerodromes; regulation and organisation of air traffic and of aerodromes excepting sanitary control of air navigation.
3. Beacons and other provision for the safety of aircraft.
4. Carriage of passengers and goods by air.
- 4A. International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO).
- 4B. International Air Transport Association (IATA).
- 4C. Commonwealth Air Transport (CATC).
- 4D. Commonwealth Advisory Aeronautical Research Council.
5. Corporation established under the Air Corporation Act, 1933.
6. Chief Commissioner of Railway Safety.

12. Now it is true that the list especially at S. No. 4 refers to carriage of passengers and goods by air and had this activity being undertaken by the department, there would have been no difficulty in holding the same to be an industry. However, the Aircraft Act, 1934 and the Aircraft Rules 1937 and from the pre-amble as well as from the various rules it is evident that the operation of Aircraft whether for the purpose of carrying goods or passenger has been left to the undertakings which may be recognised for the said purpose and what is left with the department is the function of supervision and control, which is an administrative activity and is different from the activity of carriage of passengers and goods. It is pertinent to note that the Civil Aviation Department was never declared to be a public utility service as is defined under Section 2(n) of the Industrial Disputes Act. Therefore what impressed the Lordship of Kerala High Court in Bhaskaran vs. Sub-Divisional Officer, 1982 (II), LLJ, page 248 while declaring the post and telegraph department to be an industry is conspicuously absent in the instant case.

13. The Full Bench of Punjab and Haryana High Court had occasion to deal with this question when they decided the case State of Punjab Vs. Kuldip Singh, 1983 LAB. I.C. 83 where the question involved was whether the establishment, construction and maintenance of National and State Highways is an industry or not. At page 88 the activities of State or Central Government were categorised into four sub-heads as follows:—

"(1) The sovereign or the regal functions of the State which are the primary and inalienable rights of a constitutional Government.

(2) Economic adventures clearly partaking of the nature

of trade and business undertaken by it as part of its welfare activities.

- (3) Organised activity not stamped with the total indicia of business yet bearing a resemblance to or being analogous to trade and business.
- (4) The residuary organised Governmental activity which may not come within the ambit of the aforesaid three categories."

14. So far as sovereign or regal functions of the State are concerned there will be little difficulty to hold it to be not an industry. Similarly the second category namely economic adventures which clearly and unmistakably partake of the nature of trading or business activity and there will be little difficulty to hold that it was evidently a business activity and therefore an industry. In the case of third category namely the organised activity not stamped with the total indicia of business yet bearing a resemblance to or being analogous to trade and industry it was observed that this part or category would be covered by Bangalore Water Supply case and as such can be termed as an industry.

15. Then remains the fourth category namely the residuary organised governmental activities which may not come within the ambit of the aforesaid three categories. In this regard it was observed that it would be a governmental function outside the ambit of the term industry as defined in Section 2(j) of the Act. The true test therefore regarding a particular department of Government even if it is not sovereign or the regal activity, is whether the same falls in the second or third category and if we can note a finding in the affirmative then alone a particular department though of Central or State Government can still be declared to be an industry but otherwise not. Apart from trade and business the Government has various Governmental functions which as head of the State it must undertake and merely because it was not declared as the sovereign or the regal function as held in the case above referred to, we cannot jump to the conclusion that when it is not the sovereign or the regal function it must be an industry. As held by the Lordships of the Punjab and Haryana High Court there still remains the fourth category involving the residuary organised governmental activity which does not fall within the ambit of any of the three categories and when neither strictly trade or business in nature nor even remotely resembling such activities, may not be sovereign or the regal function, still it would not fall within the ambit of industry.

16. With this test in mind if we again revert to such activities undertaken by the Ministry of Civil Aviation. We find nowhere that either it can be said to be trade or business. Certainly, had the carriage of passengers and goods by air remained as part of the activities of the department, things would have been different but since under legislation the activity has been now entrusted to some corporation, merely because the department has a general control which is necessary as a State in the interest of citizens, the activity of the corporation cannot be that of the department so as to convert it into an industry. I therefore hold that the activities as they stand do not bring the case under Section 2(j) of the Act.

17. During the course of trial by notice dated 6-6-1984 two queries were made to the Civil Aviation Department whereby it was asked whether the department paid productivity bonus for the year 1982-83. It was further asked by query No. 2 whether the department has been collecting substantial amounts from the Airlines operating over civil aviation territory, as navigation charges Shri Mane on behalf of the department to-day has replied those queries and has informed that it is not productivity linked bonus but was ad-hoc bonus payable to all Central Government Employees and is not governed by the productivity linked bonus scheme. The attempt therefore to suggest that the department pays productivity bonus and it must be held to be an industry must fail. Similarly the Civil Aviation Department is collecting Route Navigational charges from the Airlines but it cannot be said to be a business or trade activity so as to bring the case within the category Nos. 2 and 3 of the Punjab and Haryana High Court Full Bench case.

18. Having regard to all these factors, having regard to the fact that there is no proof of any activity of business or trade carried out by the Civil Aviation Department, having regard to the fact that there is no declaration as public utility service, I hold that the civil aviation department in whose service, Shri N. M. Shetty was at the relevant time of passing the final order is not proved to be an industry under Section 2(j) of the Act and therefore the employee namely Shri Shetty cannot be called a workman entitled to various reliefs.

19. Normally this disposes of the reference itself because if the employee cannot fall within the category of workman as defined in the act no doors would be open to him much less the remedy of reference, but assuming the department to be an industry, the next question would still have to be answered namely whether the action of removal from service is justified or not. Under Section 11A of the Industrial Disputes Act, assuming the same to be applicable, two factors will have to be considered before the final conclusion viz. whether there is sufficient proof of misconduct and secondly whether the final order suffers from any harshness or is disproportionate to the misconduct committed. Unless a finding one way or other on both these points is recorded the reference under Section 11A of the Act cannot be disposed of. With this view we shall now turn to the facts of the case.

20. For the said purpose it will have to be seen as to whether the misconduct as alleged has been brought home or not. Secondly whether there was any lacuna created by the non-production of certain documents namely the logbook and counterfoils of the tickets sold and whether even on the strength of proof as adduced it leads to the inference which Department wants to draw.

21. For the said purpose certain dates would be highly material and also other factors. The incident as already stated occurred on 18-11-1973 at about 11.5 P.M. There is a controversy as already referred to, as to whether in fact the incident occurred at 10.45 P.M. as tried to be put by the workman before the Enquiry Officer or whether the checking was done at 11.45 P.M. as stated by the witnesses namely S/Shri J. C. V. Tamhane and S. N. Kadam. Now from the Memorandum at page 1 in Folder No. 1 as well as the statement of charges against Shri Shetty, the case was that on the relevant day he along with Shri S. P. Boricha committed gross-misconduct and failed to maintain absolute integrity by selling the already sold-out tickets in collusion with one another. The second charge alleged that Shetty, while on duty on the said day at about 23.15 hours, he was found in possession of 23 numbers of already sold-out tickets while he was on duty at counter No. 3 which it is alleged, were handed over to him by Shri S. P. Boricha with mala fide intention of reselling the same. The charge further read that Shri Shetty was also found in possession of unaccounted money amounting to Rs. 260 whereas his current cash against the tickets actually sold-out was found short of a rupee. So far the last part of the charge was concerned the Enquiry Officer was not convinced and therefore we need not consider the same. Similarly Shri Boricha having been acquitted there being no proof of actual handing over of the tickets by Shri Boricha to Shri Shetty, the said part also need not be considered. What therefore remains to be considered is whether the charge namely Shri Shetty was found in possession of 23 numbers of already sold-out tickets is validly substantiated or not. The Enquiry Officer has answered it in the affirmative and it has to be seen whether the Enquiry Officer was justified in noting the adverse finding and whether the evidence recorded led to the same conclusion or a different one. In this regard the record shows that Shri Shetty was on shift duty from 8 P.M. and consequently he would have remained on duty till 8 A.M. It is not disputed that Shri Shetty was in charge of Counter No. 3 and was to remain in charge thereof namely till 8 A.M. It is also borne out by Folder No. VIIIA where we find shift duty and folder No. VIIIB there is logbook of Counter No. 3 which bears the entry of handing over and taking over charge at 8 P.M. on 18-11-1973 and the entries shows that Shri Shetty was placed in possession of unsold tickets bearing Nos. 50531 to 50600 from Book No. G. 303 and seven complete books bearing Nos. G. 304 to G. 310, in all he was stated to have been placed in the custody 1470 unsold tickets comprising seven full books and one semi-half book.

22. At page No. 11 in Folder No. 1 there is what is known as Statement showing the details of the tickets sold every

one hour, which a Ticket Clerk in charge of counter has to maintain and an entry at 10 P.M. shows that during the time between 20 to 21 hours and 21 hours to 22 hours in the first hour 50 tickets bearing numbers 60531 to 60580 and in the second hour 300 tickets bearing Nos. 60581 to 60880 were sold out by Shri Shetty. Now when on behalf of the authorities, Shri Thamane and Kadam say that they checked the counter at 11.15 P.M. an attempt was made on behalf of Shri Shetty to bring home that the time was 10.15 P.M. or so and it is urged that the entries in the logbook were required to be manipulated because of this change in the timing.

23. Two witnesses names Shri Thamane and Shri Kadam had stated that when Shri Shetty opened the door of counter as was asked to do 23 sold tickets were lying on the counter, he hurriedly put certain currency notes in the back pocket of his trouser and it is further stated that when the cash was counted it was found to be one rupee less but that conclusion of the witness appears to be erroneous. Since the evidence consists of these two witnesses naturally the same was attacked with vehemence and the question is whether Shri Thamane and Shri Kadam implicated Shri Shetty falsely which to their knowledge was to result in dire consequences. Shri S. N. Kadam Airport Manager was on duty at the relevant time while Shri Thamane another Airport Manager was relieved of his duties earlier but happened to be present at the relevant time. Now the witnesses stated that because on the relevant day a very very important person Shri Agha Khan was to arrive at the Airport, to receive him there was very heavy rush and as it was apprehended that the rush may result in some mischief, they checked counter No. 3. Immediately after the incident the statement of S/Shri Thamane and Kadam were recorded one at 01.05 hours of 19-11-1973 and the other at 04.00 hours of the same day vide page Nos. 12 and 14 of Folder No. 1. Not only that the statement of Shri Shetty was also recorded in his own hand vide page No. 16 of the relevant folder and though there is an attempt to suggest that the opening part of the statement was made on account of pressure and coercion of the higher authorities, the said suggestion is far from believable. I can never believe that Shri Shetty when according to him he had not committed any misconduct would have submitted to the coercion that too as to the timing of certain things, which according to him was untrue. If, therefore in the said statement the timing of visit of Shri Thamane and Shri Kadam is stated to be 23.15 hours it lends corroboration completely to the narration of the two witnesses. 23 tickets which were alleged to have found at Counter No. 3 from the custody of Shri Shetty bore the following numbers—60749, 60752, 60895, 60896, 60897, 60898, 60944, 60945, 60952, 60964, 60965, 60966, 60971, 60982, 61014, 61015, 61016, 62017, 62720, 62721, 62795, 62796 and 62847. Now we have already seen that the last ticket in hourly statement at 10 P.M. was stated to be 60880 and therefore the question to be considered is whether it is possible that within five minutes there would sale of tickets ranging from 60880 to 60895 though attempt was all along made to suggest that the visit was at 10.05 P.M. In this regard as appearing at page 12 in folder No. II we may note that Book No. G. 304 contained serial numbers from 60601 to 60300, Book G. 305 contained 60801 to 61000. Book G. 306 contained 61001 to 61200, G. 307 from 61201 to 61400, G. 308 from 61401 to 61600, G. 309 from 61601 to 61800 and G. 310 from 61801 to 62000 each book containing 200 tickets and during the time Shri Shetty was in charge of Counter No. 3 he had sold 70 tickets from the book G. 303, 200 tickets from Book No. G. 304, equal number from the Book G. 305 and 112 from Book No. 306 ending with 61112. The record shows sale of in all 582 tickets and he had Rs. 580 from the earlier incumbent and in all he possessed the cash of Rs. 1162.00.

24. Regarding one ticket there is a typographical error namely instead of quoting 61017 it was written 16017. Having regard to ticket digit, having regard to the fact that no book contained the digit beginning with '1' I am convinced about the error while noting and not prepared to give any importance to that error. It was tried to be urged that there is manipulation and something was added later on. I am not prepared to place any reliance on the suggestion particularly in the light of the evidence of two witnesses S/Shri Thamane and Kadam.

25. At page 12 of Folder No. 1 Shri Kadam stated that when enquired Shri Shetty informed him that he got those tickets from counter No. 11, at the same time he also stated that some visitors left those tickets. Now as the Enquiry report stands, the charge that Shri Boricha had sold those tickets to Shri Shetty remained unproved for want of evidence. It was therefore urged that when the case against Shri Boricha failed the same result should have followed in the case of Shri Shetty, however these two cases are something distinct and whether the case against Shri Boricha is proved or not, the fact that recovery of 23 sold tickets from the custody of Shri Shetty if held established, it will have its own consequences and it cannot be conjunctively read with the incident of Shri Boricha and the charge against him, and the failure of the management to bring home the charge to him that resulted in his exoneration, cannot lead to the same thing in the case of Shri Shetty. On the contrary various replies given by Shri Shetty, the time of incident, recovery of 23 sold tickets are the factors which speak against him and that it would mean that if he advanced different explanations at different junctures, that he was not in a position to convincingly advance the explanation for the same. When the tickets were sold there was no reason to come back to the counter, either they would be with the gate ticket collector or in the box, where deposited. No ticket normally would have gone back to the issuing clerk. The fact, that as many as 23 tickets were found with Shri Shetty read with the fact that he was unable to render any explanation, establishes the charge levelled against him. In this connection the evidence of S/Shri Thamane and Kadam supported by Shri Lokre, who was examined by the defence and was called at their instance supports fully that part of the charge namely recovery of 23 tickets. Before the Enquiry Officer Shri Shetty was not in a position to give any convincing reasons. The evidence of S/Shri Manekar and Pophelankar did not advance his case at all.

26. Normally there should have been entries in the hourly statement about the sale of tickets between 10 P.M. and 11 P.M. but the incident having occurred immediately thereafter it is just possible that Shri Shetty had no time to fill in the entries. It is equally possible that because he was receiving already sold tickets, he avoided to make the entries. Considering from any angle, the absence of entries at 11 P.M. can never lead to inference that the checking took place immediately after 10 P.M. particularly having regard to the numbers appearing on the recovered tickets.

27. The Enquiry Officer had given all opportunities and had satisfied the test of natural justice. There is also absolutely no force in the contention that adverse inference should be drawn for non-production of logbook and counterfoils. For counterfoils the explanation rendered was that these books are destroyed after a period of three months. Normally they should have been preserved but in the light of the material on record in my view, the case of the management does not suffer from any infirmities by the non-production of the logbook, the same is the case in respect of counterfoils. Shri Kadam has explained the correction of the entries from 22.15 to 23.15 hours and there is no reason to disbelieve the said explanation. By being on record it would not have advanced the case one way or other. The attempt to suggest that this was done in the course of enquiry, is also unnecessarily to cast aspersions on the enquiry officer which cannot be believed even for a moment. I therefore hold that though the management should have preserved the counterfoils and should have produced the logbook which was produced during the enquiry their absence does not affect in any manner from the evidentiary value of the material on record.

28. When the Enquiry Officer therefore concluded that the recovery of 23 tickets and the resultant charge was established I see no reason to disagree with him and on the contrary even an independent appraisal of the evidence on record leads to the same conclusion. I therefore endorse the said findings.

29. The order of removal has been passed by the Deputy Director General in his capacity as disciplinary authority. Shri Mane on behalf of the Civil Aviation Department has filed extract of Schedule, General Central Services Class II where Deputy Director General of Civil Aviation has been shown as a appointment authority an authority competent to

impose penalties. When Shri Shetty is held to be in the service of the Civil Aviation Department, having been repatriated to the department, the International Airports Authority of India was left with no control and appointing authority and disciplinary authority were competent to pass final order and accordingly it has been so passed on 19-12-1977 vide folder No. 8. Against the said order as seen from folder No. 7 there was an appeal dated 22-2-1978, on receipt of which the office had put up a note at S. No. (d) and on 22-4-1978 the Director General dismissed the appeal having found no substance. Against the said order there was an appeal to the Minister concerned but the same seems to have been sent back to the Director General on 18-12-1978. Yet whether the appeal to the Hon'ble Minister was decided or not, the avenues as contemplated namely the appeal to the Director General having been followed, the effect of the subsequent appeal is of no importance.

30. On going through the evidence, on going through the record as it stands, I am convinced about the proof of the charge of recovery of 23 sold tickets from the custody of Shri Shetty. Even the possession of Rs. 260 is a circumstance which speaks against him. He was on duty from 8 P.M. to 8 A.M. I cannot believe that anybody would carry such a big sum to such an isolated place like aerodrome with a view to hand over to his mother. Furthermore there was no reason to put the money in his pocket hurriedly as seen by Shri Kadam and he was also not in a position to tell the exact money which was lying with him. What has been observed by the Enquiry Officer in this regard assumes importance.

31. Once we arrived at this conclusion the next question would be whether the order of removal is justifiable. The employee was selling tickets and he had no business to collect already sold tickets. His conduct therefore speaks of dishonesty and once there is proof of dishonesty and intention of making money by dishonest means, the management would not be prepared to reinstate the employee in the service and having regard to the gravity of the offence of dishonesty on the part of the employee I am convinced that the punishment of removal from service is in no way harsh or the punishment awarded is disproportionate. Negligence can be tolerated so also mistake can be tolerated but not the dishonesty and absence of integrity. I therefore hold that the punishment awarded is justified.

The reference therefore fails.

Award accordingly. No order as to costs.

M. A. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer
[No. L-11012/1/82-D.IV (A)]

New Delhi, the 17th August, 1984

S.O. 2761.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Kanpur in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Superintendent of Post Offices, Jaunpur and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 28th July, 1984.

BEFORE SHRI R. B. SRIVASTAVA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR

I.D. No. 164 of 1981 (Old)

I.D. No. 11 of 1984 (New)

PRESENT :

Sri R. B. Srivastava, Presiding Officer.

In Re :

Sri Ram Adhar Yadav, Post & Village Dilla Ka Pura, District Jaunpur.

Versus

The Superintendent, Post Offices, Jaunpur Branch, Mohalla Rasmandal, Jaunpur.

638 GI/84—12.

PRESENCE :

Present for Workmen—Sri Ram Jope Dubey.

Present for Employers—None.

AWARD

The Central Government, as appropriate Government, vide its Order No. L. 40012(1)/81-D.II(D), dated 16th November, 1981 referred an industrial dispute to the Tribunal under Section 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) in the following terms :—

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the Superintendent of post Offices, Jaunpur Division, in terminating the services of Shri Ram Adhar Yadav, Extra Departmental Branch Post Master, Dilla Ka Pura with effect from 20th September, 1975, was legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

2. On receipt of the reference notices were sent to the parties. A statement of claim was filed by the workman, and thereafter a written statement was filed by the Respondent. The Respondent raised a number of objections and took the plea that the Respondent was never an ‘Industry’ and the dispute if any is not an industrial dispute as the Respondent P. & T. Department discharges sovereign functions. They further took the pleas that the services of the petitioner were purely temporary liable to be terminated without notice. In the end they averred that the claim is incompetent, baseless and untenable.

3. The Employers, Respondent never turned up thereafter to contest the case. It is clear ground that the petitioner was appointed on 17-1-1973 and his services were terminated on 20-9-1975. The employers apparently terminated his services under Rule 6 of P. & T. Extra Department agents (Conduct and Service) Rules 1964 which reads as follows :—

“The services of an employee who has not already rendered more than three years continuous services from the date of his appointment shall be liable to termination by the appointing authority at any time without notice for generally unsatisfactory work, or on any administrative ground unconnected with his conduct.”

4. Thus the crux of the matters to be decided is whether the Postal Department would come under the purview of ‘INDUSTRY’ or not or is exempted being sovereign functions. In Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board, S.A. Rajappa (1978(2) S.C. 213) it was held that all such undertakings where the systematic activity organised by co-operation between employer and employee and calculated to satisfy human wants and wishes (not spiritual or religious) is undertaken it comes under the definition of the ‘Industry’. On the basis of such principle the Kerala High Court in K.R.B. Kaimal and another vs. Director of Postal Services, Trivandrum held “Public utility service like postal telegraph or telegraphs etc. come within ambit of industry as defined in Act”. In the above quoted ruling at para 16 it was observed. “In view of this latest decision of the Supreme Court by a Bench consisting of Seven Judges I do not think that there could be any controversy now that the postal department would come within the ambit of the word ‘Industry’ as defined in the Act.”

5. In these circumstances the petitioner having worked in the in the department for more than 240 days was entitled to be terminated according to law i.e. giving him retrenchment compensation, notice, notice pay etc. This having not been done the termination order is liable to be quashed, with the result that the petitioner is deemed to be in continuous service from the date of termination.

6. I accordingly give my Ex-parte Award that the action of Superintendent of Post Offices Jaunpur Division, Jaunpur in terminating the services of Shri Ram Adhar Yadav, Extra Departmental Branch Post Master, Dilla Ka Pura, w.e.f. 20th September, 1975 was illegal and unjustified and the petitioner is entitled to be reinstated with continuity of service and all back wages. In the circumstances there will be no order as to cost.

R. B. SRIVASTAVA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-40012/1/81-D.II(B)]
T. B. SITARAMAN, Desk Officer

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 26 जुलाई, 1984

का. आ 2762.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में विशाखापत्तनम् पोर्ट ट्रस्ट, विशाखापत्तनम् के प्रबंधन से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री आई. पाण्डू रंगा राव होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या विशाखापत्तनम् पोर्ट ट्रस्ट प्रबंधन की विशाखापत्तनम् पोर्ट ट्रस्ट में सी. आई. एस. एफ. के लागू किये जाने के बाद 20-10-1971 को श्री एम. बी. थापा तथा 47 अन्य कर्मचारों की सेवाएं समाप्त करने और छंटनी के तुरन्त बाद प्रस्तावित की गई खलासियों की रिक्तियों में छंटनी किये गये कर्मचारों में से किसी को भी नियोजित न करने की भी कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं?”

[संख्या एल-34011/5/83-डी-4 (ए)]

एस. एस. पराशर, डेस्क अधिकारी

ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th July, 1984

S.O. 2762.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Visakhapatnam Port Trust, Visakhapatnam and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri I. Pandu Rangarao shall be the Presiding Officer with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of VPT in terminating the services of Sri M. B. Thapa and 47 others on 20-10-71 after introduction of C.I.S.F. in Visakhapatnam Port Trust and also in not employing any of the retrenched workmen in the proposed vacancies of Khalasis immediately after the retrenchment is justified? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled to?”

[No. L-34011/5/83-D.IV(A)]
S. S. PRASHER, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 31st July, 1984

S.O. 2763.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Benedih Colliery in Barora Area No. 1 of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office Nawagarh, Distt. Dhanbad, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 28th July, 1984.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 124 of 1982

In the matter of an industrial dispute under Section 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Benedih Colliery in Barora Area No. 1 of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Nawagarh, District Dhanbad and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the employers—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

On behalf of the workmen—Shri B. Lal, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal

Dhanbad, the 23rd July, 1984

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under section 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Order No. L-20012(130)/82-D.III (A), dated, the 27th August, 1982.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demand of the workmen of Benedih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Nawagarh, District Dhanbad for Grade-I Store Keeper Promotion from 1975 retrospectively, as against promotion from February, 1980, to Shri K. P. Singh, Store Keeper is justified? If so, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?”

The case of the workmen is that the concerned workman Shri K. P. Singh was working as Store Keeper since before take over and nationalisation of Benedih Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. The concerned workman was demanding the correct wages and other benefits of Store Keeper, Grade-I since the time of amalgamation of Pilonjoria section where he was working in Benedih Colliery. But the management was shelving the matter on some plea or the other. The concerned workman was full in charge as Store Keeper. Other Store Keepers like him in the Collieries of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. had been given the wages and other benefits of Grade-I clerk vide Office order dated 2nd February, 1980 issued under the signature of Personnel Manager, Barora Area, the management placed the concerned workman in Grade-I showing him promoted from Asstt. Store Keeper to Store Keeper. The concerned workman objected to his promotion from February, 1980 and demanding that he should be treated in Grade-I with retrospective effect since the time he was working as Store Keeper in charge. When the management did not agree, the present dispute was raised by the Coalfield Labour Union and ultimately the said dispute was referred to the Tribunal for adjudication by the Government of India.

It was the nature of the job being performed by the concerned workman which is to be taken as criteria for fixation of the grade and it was not entirely the discretion of the management to fix the grade of the Clerk according to their whims and caprice. The management was not justified in denying wages of Grade-I when the concerned workman was found working as Store Keeper. The concerned workman is entitled to Grade-I clerk and its wages retrospectively from 1975 when Shri A. N. Roy was transferred.

The case of the management is that the Promotion is management's function and no workman can claim promotion as a matter of right. The management had introduced rules of promotions in the year 1975 and before that there was no rule of promotions. According to the rule of promotion all the clerks of Grade-II in the area are grouped together and thereafter seniority is determined amongst them depending upon the number of vacancies existing at a particular period. The promotions are held on the basis of recommendation by Departmental Promotion Committee. The D.P.C. considers and recommends candidate for promotion according to the seniority subject to satisfactory performance judged on the basis of Confidential reports. According to the said procedure the concerned workman was promoted from Grade-II to Grade-I in 1980. The workman had been fixed proper grade according to the Wage Board Recommendation on the basis of job performed by him before the introduction of promotion scheme. Under the Wage Board Recommendation the Store Keepers have been fixed in Clerical Grade-II and Clerical Grade-I as well. The Store Keeper used to be placed in Grade-I or Grade-II at the discretion of the management considering their qualifications merit, seniority and nature of experience gained by them. The concerned workman was Grade-II Store Keeper of erstwhile Pinoljaria Colliery and he was allowed to continue in the same grade till he was promoted to Grade-I Store Keeper. The concerned workman along with other were posted at Benedih Colliery Stores and all of them were in Grade-II. Shri R. C. Tewary who was senior to the concerned workman, was also in Grade-II working in the same Stores. The concerned workman was never in full incharge as a Store Keeper. He was working as Asstt. to Shri R. C. Tewary who was senior to the concerned workman. The Colliery stores get materials from the regional stores and remains under the control of the Regional Stores. The work of Store Keeper at the colliery stores does not involve responsibilities similar to Store Keeper of Regional Stores. The demand of the union for Grade-I with its wages retrospectively is without any basis and as such it is liable to be rejected.

The only question to be determined is whether the concerned workman is entitled for promotion as Grade-I Store Keeper from 1975 retrospectively.

The concerned workman has examined himself as WW-1. The management has examined three witnesses in support of their case. The concerned workman has produced five exhibits and the management has produced 12 documents in support of their respective cases.

The concerned workman WW-1 has stated that he had joined as Store Keeper for the first time in Grade-II and that after amalgamation of the collieries in 1973 there was one Grade-I Store Keeper named Shri A. N. Roy in Benedih Colliery. He has stated that in 1975 Shri A. N. Roy was transferred from Benedih Colliery and thereafter no one was given the post of Grade-I Store Keeper in Benedih Colliery. He has claimed Grade-I Store Keeper post since the transfer of Shri A. N. Roy. He has stated that he was never designated as Asstt. Store Keeper and had never worked as Asstt. Store Keeper. Admittedly, he got Grade-I Store Keeper in February, 1980. According to him Shri R. C. Tewary is junior to him. In order to show that he was senior to Shri R. C. Tewary, he had stated that at the time of nationalisation he was in Grade-II Store Keeper whereas Shri R. C. Tewary was in Grade-III Clerk in the same colliery. He has further stated that Shri Tewary got Grade-I Store Keeper sometime in 1980 after the regularisation of the concerned workman in Store Keeper Grade-I. He has further stated that the grade of Store Keeper in all the collieries except Benedih is of Grade-I and that in the year 1975 also all the Store Keepers were in Grade-I. He has stated that he claims Grade-I Store Keeper since May/June, 1975 as he had been working as Store Keeper in place of Shri A. N. Roy. From the evidence of WW-1 it appears that he is claiming post of Grade-I Store Keeper on the basis that he was working as Store Keeper in place of Shri A. N. Roy after his transfer and that as Shri Roy was Grade-I Store Keeper, he should also get the post of Grade-I Store Keeper since the time of transfer of Shri A. N. Roy. It is important to verify this statement of WW-1 which apparently will appear not supported by documents filed in this reference. Ext. M-9 dated 25-6-75 is the Office Order by which Shri A. N. Roy Store Keeper Grade-I Benedih Colliery was transferred to Regional Stores Kharkharee with immediate effect. It will further appear from this Ext. that Manager of the Benedih Colliery was advised to release him. Ext. M-10 dated 23-7-75 is the letter of the Manager, Benedih Colliery to Shri A. N. Roy whereby Shri Roy was released from Benedih

Colliery and was asked to handover charge to Shri R. C. Tewary, Store Keeper. Ext. M-11 will show that the concerned workman had taken charge of the Stores from Shri R. C. Tewary. MW-2 Shri P. N. Choudhury who is working as Senior Personal Officer has stated that when he joined in July, 1979 he found Shri R. C. Tewary as a Store Keeper of Benedih Colliery and that in December, 1979 Shri Tewary was transferred to Phulartand Colliery and before his transfer Shri Tewary was incharge of the stores. He has further stated that the concerned workman took charge of the stores from Shri Tewary. WW-3 who is working as P.O. clerk has stated that Shri R. C. Tewary and the concerned workman were both categorised in Grade-II Store Keeper w.e.f. 1-5-73 and before that they were not in any proper grade. He has further stated that Shri R. C. Tewary was senior to the concerned workman and that in November, 1975 Shri R. C. Tewary took over charge of the stores from A. N. Roy on his transfer. The evidence of Management's witnesses that Shri R. C. Tewary was senior to the concerned workman is supported by the seniority list of Grade-I Store Keeper, Ext. M-1 which was published on 14-10-82. It will appear from Ext. M-1 that the earlier seniority list published on 12th August, 1982 was subsequently amended after enquiry and thereafter this list was being published. It will appear from this seniority list dated 14-10-82 that Shri R. C. Tewary was senior to the concerned workman. In view of the fact that Shri R. C. Tewary had first joined his post in the Colliery on 1-8-72 about three months prior to the joining of service by the concerned workman on 30-11-72 and the seniority in the date of joining perhaps weighed with the management in correcting their earlier seniority list and declaring Shri R. C. Tewary senior to Shri K. P. Singh. The concerned workman has exhibited the seniority list Ext. W-5 dated 12-8-82, which was amended vide Ext. M-1 dated 14-10-82. The management has exhibited its promotion policy Ext. M-7. The principles of promotion is stated in para 6.00, 6.1 and 6.2. It states that for the purpose of promotion from Grade-II to Grade-I employees will be promoted on the basis of seniority as the main criteria subject to their satisfactory performance. The principles of seniority are stated in para 7.00 to 7.3. It provides that seniority will be counted from the date an employee has been appointed or promoted to a particular grade and when the date of appointment or promotion in the grade is the same, the seniority of the employee will be resolved by going backward in the earlier grade and by going back until the date of first appointment in the Company. Ext. M-3 is the Departmental Promotion Committee Report from which it will appear that Shri R. C. Tewary and Shri K. P. Singh were in Grade-II since 1-5-73 MW-3 has also stated that both of them were categorised Grade-II Store Keeper from 1-5-73. Thus both of them being in the grade from the same date, the management had considered the date of first appointment in order to fix the seniority of Shri R. C. Tewary and the concerned workman in Ext. M-1 and the same appears to be in conformity with the principles of seniority. It is clear, therefore, that Shri R. C. Tewary was senior to the concerned workman.

It has further been established from Ext. M-10 that after Shri A. N. Roy was transferred he was asked to hand over charge to Shri R. C. Tewary, Store Keeper and as such the claim of the concerned workman that he had taken the charge of Shri A. N. Roy after his transfer is falsified and the said fact as stated by the concerned workman cannot be accepted. It will appear from the evidence discussed above that Shri Tewary had taken over charge from Shri A. N. Roy as he was senior to the concerned workman and as such it cannot be said that the concerned workman was in place of Shri A. N. Roy in the capacity of Grade-I Store Keeper. It was only after Shri Tewary was transferred that the concerned charge from Shri Tewary who was in Store Keeper Grade-II while working at Benedih Colliery. It is clear therefore that the concerned workman was not working as Grade-I Store Keeper in Benedih Colliery after the transfer of Shri A. N. Roy. At page -54 of the report of the Central Wage Board Recommendation Vol. II the grading and nomenclature of Clerical staff is stated. It will appear from it that Store Keepers have been shown in Grade-I as well as in Grade-II. It will further appear that Asstt. Store Keeper is also shown in Grade-II. Thus Store Keepers according to the Wage Board Recommendation were in Grade-I as well as Grade-II and were Asstt. Store Keeper also were in Grade-II. There is no evidence to the effect that the management had declared that the post of Store Keeper at Benedih Colliery will be the post of Grade-I Store Keeper. It was for the management to decide the grade of the Store Keeper and the Tribunal cannot decide that the post of Store Keeper at Benedih Colliery would be of Grade-I.

The management did promote the concerned workman as Grade-I Store Keeper on the recommendation of the Departmental Promotion Committee. The claim being made by the concerned workman that as he was senior to Shri R. C. Tewari he had taken over charge of the Stores from Shri A. N. Roy has been found to be incorrect. Even if the concerned workman had taken charge from Shri A. N. Roy it cannot be claimed as a matter of right that the concerned workman should get the post of Grade-I Store Keeper as Grade-I has to be decided by the Departmental Promotion Committee in accordance with the promotion rules. In my opinion, the concerned workman has failed to establish his claim that he should be deemed to be in Grade-I Store Keeper since the time of the transfer of Shri A. N. Roy. Before closing this Award I would like to refer to Ext. M-2 dated 2nd February, 1983 which is the Office Order promoting the concerned workman from Grade-II Store Keeper to Grade-I Store Keeper. It will appear from Ext. M-2 that the concerned workman Shri K. P. Singh was shown as Asstt. Store Keeper at the time of this promotion to Grade-I Store Keeper. There is no document to show that the concerned workman was designated as Asstt. Store Keeper on the contrary there are papers namely Ext. W-1 dated 5-11-77, W-2 dated 18-3-79, W-3 dated 12-11-75 which show that the concerned workman was always described by the management as Store Keeper. In Ext. W-2 both Shri R. C. Tewari and the concerned workman were shown designated as Store Keeper. Had the concerned workman been designated as Asstt. Store Keeper he would not have been shown as Store Keeper along with Shri R. C. Tewari in Ext. W-2. In case the concerned workman was Asstt. Store Keeper he would have been shown as Asstt. Store Keeper in Ext. W-2 where Shri R. C. Tewari has been shown as Store Keeper. In my opinion the concerned workman has not been correctly designated in Ext. M-2 as Asstt. Store Keeper and it must be said that he was Store Keeper along with Shri R. C. Tewari since the year 1973 in Grade-II. In actual practice the designation of Asstt. Store Keeper and Store Keeper does not create much difference as Store Keeper and Asstt. Store Keeper are both in Grade-II. The matter could have some importance if the Asstt. Store Keeper was given a grade lower to that of Store Keeper Grade-II. As a result the concerned workman cannot make much out of this mistake on the part of the management in describing him as Asstt. Store Keeper as the time he was promoted as Store Keeper Grade-I.

Taking the entire facts, evidence and circumstances of the case into consideration I hold that the concerned workman is not entitled for promotion as Grade-I Store Keeper from 1975 retrospectively. As such I hold that the demand of the workman of Benedih Colliery for Grade-I Store Keeper promotion from 1975 retrospectively as against promotion from February, 1980 to the concerned workman Shri K. P. Singh Store Keeper is not justified. Accordingly, he is not entitled to any relief.

This is my Award.

I. N. SINHA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-20012(130)/82-D III(A)]

New Delhi, the 9th August, 1984

S.O. 2764.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1 Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Jamadoba Colliery of M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Company Ltd., Post Office Jamadoba, Distt. Dhanbad, and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 31st July, 1984.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Reference No. 20 of 1982

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Jamadoba

Colliery of M/s. Tata Iron and Steel Company Ltd.,
Post Office Jamadoba, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice Manoranjan Prasad (Retd.), Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri S. P. Sahi, General Secretary,
Bharatiya Mazdoor Manch.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 25th July, 1984

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012(425)/81-D. III(A) dated, the 19th February, 1982, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Jamadoba Colliery of Messrs Tata Iron & Steel Company Ltd., in showing the date of appointment of Shri Sheo Nandan, Compressor Khalasi, as the 22nd May, 1961 and making him permanent from this date, instead of the 7th November, 1957, is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled ?"

2. The case of the management is that the concerned workman Sheo Nandan was initially appointed as a badli/temporary worker with effect from 7-11-1957 and he worked intermittently as and when required. When a permanent vacancy in the post of general mazdoor arose, he was absorbed in that post with effect from 22-5-1961. Adrema printing system was introduced by the management in the year 1959, and, while printing the date of his appointment in his service card, it was erroneously printed as 7-11-1957 instead of 22-5-1961. Identity Card was also issued to him in the year 1959 through adrema print in which also similar mistake was committed. The mistake was committed because he had joined the company as a badli/temporary workman with effect from 7-11-1957 but his permanent employment was effected from 22-5-1961. The mistake in embossing the date of his appointment in his service card was detected when new service cards were introduced in the year 1964 by Kardex system and accordingly the correction was made in his service card. He made an application dated 11-5-81 for correcting his date of appointment as 7-11-1957 whereupon the Chief Personnel Manager (Collieries) had examined the matter and had explained to him the correct position vide letter dated 25-8-1981. There is, therefore, no valid ground to fix the date of his permanent appointment as 7-11-1957 as claimed by him and the management is justified in showing the date of his appointment as 22-5-1961 and making him permanent from that date.

3. The case of the concerned workman, on the other hand, is that he had been working permanently and regularly with effect from 7-11-1957 and he was also issued identity card in which the date of his appointment was correctly mentioned as 7-11-1957 which has been subsequently changed by the management to 22-5-1961 in most arbitrary manner. His prayer, therefore, is that the date of his appointment should be treated as 7-11-1957 instead of 22-5-1961.

4. One witness has been examined on behalf of the management, who has also been cross-examined on behalf of the concerned workman. Certain documents have also been filed by the management which have been marked Exts. M-1, M-2 and M-3. On behalf of the concerned workman neither he has been examined, nor any other witness has been examined on his behalf, nor any document has been filed or exhibited on his behalf.

5. Sri Sachidanand Ghosh (MW-1) is an employee of M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. at Jamadoba since last 25 years and presently he is working as Record Keeper, Personnel Department, since 1958. He has deposed that in the establishment of M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Co. Ltd. the date of

appointment of an employee is taken as the date of his permanent appointment against a permanent post. He has proved the service record of the concerned workman Sheo Nandan which has been marked as Ext. M-1 from which it appears that his date of birth as noted in the service record is 1-11-1921 and he joined the service of the company for the first time on 7-11-1957 as a temporary mazdoor and on 22-5-1961, he became permanent general mazdoor and since then he continued to be the employee of the company at Jamadoba colliery till he retired as haulage khalasi of Jamadoba colliery on 31-10-1982 after being given one year's extension after attaining the age of superannuation which is 60 years. He has further deposed that the aforesaid service record Ext. M-1 had been prepared by Kardex printing system which was introduced in the company in the year 1964 and before that service records by adrema printing system used to be maintained and after the kardex printing system was introduced in the year 1964 identity cards were issued to the workman concerned in which also the date of birth, date of appointment, name and address along with personal number and ticket number were mentioned, and such an identity card was also issued to the concerned workman Sheo Nandan in which the date of his appointment was mentioned as 22-5-61. He has further proved the application dated 11-5-1981 (Ext. M-2) which the concerned workman had addressed to the Chief Personnel Manager (C), Jamadoba in which he had complained that he was appointed on 7-11-1957 as a general mazdoor and had been issued identity card accordingly but on the supply of new identity card the date of his appointment was incorrectly shown as 22-5-1961 due to which he was likely to be deprived of several benefits, and had prayed for making the necessary correction in the new identity card regarding the date of his appointment. He has further proved the reply dated 25th August, 1981 (Ext. M-3) of the Chief Personnel Manager (C) to the concerned workman in which the Chief Personnel Manager (C) had informed him that his records had been checked up from which it had been found that he was employed on 22-5-61 and the date of his employment had been correctly recorded as 22-5-1961 and hence the management was unable to accede to his request for correction of the date of his appointment as 7-11-1957 instead of 22-5-61. He has been cross-examined on behalf of the concerned workman but nothing particular has come out in his cross-examination to discredit him. As already mentioned above, neither the concerned workman has examined himself, nor any other witness has been examined on his behalf, nor any document has been filed or exhibited on his behalf, and, therefore, the aforesaid evidence adduced on behalf of the management remains ex-parte which I see no reason to disbelieve.

6. In the result, on the management's aforesaid ex-parte evidence, it must be held that the action of the management in showing the date of appointment of the concerned workman Sheo Nandan as 22-5-1961 and making him permanent from that date instead of 7-11-1957 is justified and the concerned workman is not entitled to any relief. The reference is answered and the award is made accordingly, but in the circumstance of the case there shall be no order as to costs.

MANORANJAN PRASAD, Presiding Officer,
[No. L-20012(425)/81-D.III(A)]
A. V. S. SARMA, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 2 अगस्त, 1984

का० आ० 2765:—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम 1948, (1948 का 34) की धारा 16 (1) के अनुसरण में, श्री एम. एम. माथुर के स्थान पर श्री बी. एस. रामास्वामी, आई. ए. एण्ड ए. एस. को 1 अगस्त, 1984 के पूर्वाह्न से आगामी आदेश जारी होने तक महानिदेशक, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या ए-12026/1/84-एच आई.]

New Delhi, the 2nd August, 1984

S.O. 2765.—In pursuance of section 16(1) of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government appoints Shri B. S. Ramaswamy, IA & AS as Director General Employees' State Insurance Corporation, with effect from the forenoon of the 1st August, 1984, until further orders vice Shri M. M. Mathur.

[No. A-12026/1/84-HI]

नई दिल्ली, 6 अगस्त, 1984

आदेश

का० आ० 2766:—राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 8 के उप-नियम (4) में दी गई शक्ति का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम के क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, उत्तर प्रदेश को ऐसा अधिसूचित कार्यालय विनिर्दिष्ट करती है जिसके वे कर्मचारी जिन्हें हिन्दी में प्रवीणता प्राप्त हैं 10 अगस्त, 1984 से संलग्न सूची में विनिर्दिष्ट सभी सरकारी काम-काज में टिप्पण, प्रारूपण और अन्य सभी शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए केवल हिन्दी प्रयोग करेंगे।

2. इस आदेश का यह अर्थ नहीं किया जाएगा कि जहाँ राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 या किसी अन्य विधि के अधीन किसी अन्य भाषा का प्रयोग करना आवश्यक या अपेक्षित है, वहाँ उस भाषा का उक्त अधिसूचित कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम के क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय उत्तर प्रदेश के सरकारी काम-काज में प्रयोग नहीं किया जाएगा।

[संख्या ई-11012/3/83-एच. आई.]
चित्रा चोपड़ा, निदेशक

सूची

क्रमांक	सम्बन्धित विषय
1	2
1.	कर्मचारियों के व्यक्तिगत मामले
2.	डी. पी. सी. के निर्देश संबंधी विषय
3.	परीक्षा संबंधी विषय
4.	साक्षात्कार संबंधी विषय
5.	नियुक्ति संबंधी विषय
6.	परिबीक्षा संबंधी विषय
7.	अवकाश स्वीकृति संबंधी विषय
8.	प्रशिक्षण संबंधी विषय
9.	क्षैमासिक टंकण संबंधी विषय
10.	षट्मासिक टंकण संबंधी विषय
11.	लेखा पुस्तिका रख-रखाव संबंधी विषय
12.	कर्मचारियों के वेतन वृद्धि संबंधी विषय
13.	स्थानीय कार्यालयों के कर्मचारियों की स्वीकृति संबंधी विषय
14.	सेवा निवृत्ति संबंधी विषय

15. क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय के कर्मचारियों की स्वीकृति संबंधी विषय
16. बीमा निरीक्षक प्रशिक्षण संबंधी विषय
17. स्थानान्तरण संबंधी विषय
18. अनुसूचित जाति/जनजाति के आरक्षण संबंधी विषय
19. आदेशों/अनुदेशों संबंधी विषय
20. कार्यालय समग्रपरिभूता संबंधी विषय
21. कारखाना/स्थापना पंजीकरण संबंधी विषय
22. कूट संख्या आबंटन विषय
23. कारखानों के सर्वेक्षण संबंधी विषय
24. कारखानों के निरीक्षण संबंधी विषय
25. कोडेड चालान संबंधी विषय
26. कारखानों/स्थापनाओं के साथ पत्राचार संबंधी विषय
27. कारखानों के नियोजकों से बकाया वसूली संबंधी विषय
28. कारखानों की अभिलेख दिलाने से संबंधी विषय
29. हिन्दी टंकण/आशुलिपि प्रशिक्षण संबंधी विषय
30. अंग्रेजी से हिन्दी में अनुवाद संबंधी विषय
31. कार्यशालाएं चलाने संबंधी विषय
32. मासिक विवरण संबंधी विषय
33. हिन्दी से प्रगामी प्रयोग संबंधी विषय
34. मासिक/त्रैमासिक हिन्दी की रिपोर्ट
35. स्थानीय कार्यालयों की हिन्दी के प्रयोग से संबंधित निरीक्षण
36. पत्र प्राप्ति एवं प्रेषण विषय
37. बैंक समाधान विवरण
38. हिन्दी की प्रगति रिपोर्ट
39. स्थानीय कार्यालयों की बैंक व्यवस्था
40. क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों की बैंक व्यवस्था
41. क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय का आकस्मिक कोष का स्थानान्तरण
42. बैंक ड्राफ्ट व बैंक के संबंध में
43. कर्मचारियों के आकस्मिक अवकाश के मामले
44. सामान्य आदेश/परिपत्रों से संबंधित विषय
45. लेखा से संबंधित विषय
46. घोषणा पत्र संबंधी विषय
47. प्रशासन संबंधी विविध विषय
48. हिन्दी आदेश/अनुदेश/परिपत्र संबंधी विषय
49. ब्लाक बनाने संबंधी विषय
50. द्वितीय परिचय पत्रों की आपूर्ति
51. विभिन्न मामलों से संबंधी विषय
52. पंजीकरण उच्च संशोधन विषय
53. विवाह संबंधी विषय
54. अन्तर्वेशीय स्थानान्तरण विषय
55. कर्मचारियों के नाम व पिता के नाम का संशोधन
56. पंजीकरण संबंधित विषय
57. चिकित्सा पूर्ति एवं प्रशासन संबंधी विषय
58. चिकित्सा पूर्ति से संबंधित परिपत्र विषय
59. कर्मचारियों को अग्रिम भुगतान चिकित्सा पूर्ति से संबंधित विषय
60. वापस आने जाने वाले बिल एवं लेखा संबंधी आपत्तियां
61. मुख्यालय संबंधी पत्राचार एवं अन्य विषय

62. टेन्डर निकालना
63. फार्मों की प्रिंटिंग कराना
64. मासिक विवरण प्रतिवेदन संबंधी विषय
65. क्षेत्रीय परिषद की बैठकों से संबंधी विषय
66. स्थानीय समितियों की बैठकों से संबंधी विषय
67. विभिन्न क्षेत्रों में योजना का प्रसार संबंधी विषय
68. आन्तरिक लेखा परीक्षा रिपोर्ट पर अभियुक्तियां/मामले एवं अन्य विषय
69. सीमित व्यक्तियों की शिकायतों पर की गई कार्रवाई एवं निराकरण
70. चिकित्सा पूर्ति नकद हितलाभ संबंधी कर्मचारियों के विभिन्न विषय
71. सौख्यकी संबंधी मामले एवं अन्य विषय
72. बुर्षटना का मामला
73. चिकित्सा परिषद का मामला
74. आश्रित जन हितलाभ का मामला
75. एक मुश्त भुगतान का मामला
76. ए. ए. टी. से संबंधित विषय
77. पी. डी. बी. एंड डी. बी. के मूल्यांकन का मामला
78. एसिक यूनियन से संबंधित पत्राचार विषय
79. सतर्कता संबंधी शिकायतों के विषय
80. निलम्बन आदि संबंधी विषय
81. चार्जशीट से संबंधित विषय
82. राज्य सरकार से पत्राचार संबंधी विषय

ORDER

New Delhi, the 6th August, 1984

S.O. 2766.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (4) of rule 8 of the Official Language (Use for Official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby specifies that the employees of the notified Regional Office of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation, Uttar Pradesh who have obtained proficiency in Hindi, shall use Hindi alone in all official work for noting, drafting and all other official purposes, specified in the Schedule annexed hereto with effect from the 10th August, 1984.

2. It shall not be construed from this Order that no other language will be used in the official work in the said notified Regional Office of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation, Uttar Pradesh where it is necessary or essential under the Official Language (Use for Official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 or any other law.

[No. E-11012/3/83-HI]

CHITRA CHOPRA, Director

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Subject
1	2
1.	Personal matters of employees.
2.	Subjects relating to D.P.C. instructions.
3.	Subjects relating to examination.
4.	Subjects relating to interview.
5.	Subjects relating to appointments.
6.	Subjects relating to probation.
7.	Subjects relating to sanction of leave.
8.	Subjects relating to training.
9.	Subjects relating to quarterly typing.
10.	Subjects relating to half yearly typing.

11. Subjects relating to maintenance of o/c books.
12. Subjects relating to increments of employees.
13. Subjects relating to sanction of staff for L.Os.
14. Subjects relating to retirement.
15. Subjects relating to sanction of staff for Regional Office.
16. Subjects relating to training of I.I.
17. Subjects relating to transfers.
18. Subjects relating to reservation of SC/ST.
19. Subjects relating to Orders/instructions.
20. Subjects relating to O.T. Allowance.
21. Subjects relating to registration of factory/establishment.
22. Subjects relating to allotment of code No.
23. Subjects relating to survey of factories.
24. Subjects relating to inspection of factories.
25. Subjects relating to coded challan.
26. Subjects relating to correspondence with factories/estts.
27. Subjects relating to recovery of arrears from the employers of factories.
28. Subjects relating to production of records of factories.
29. Subjects relating to training in Hindi typewriting/stenography.
30. Subjects relating to translation from English to Hindi.
31. Subjects relating to holding of workshops.
32. Subjects relating to monthly statements.
33. Subjects relating to progressive use of Hindi.
34. Monthly and Quarterly Hindi reports.
35. Inspection of Local offices regarding use of Hindi.
36. Subjects relating to receipt and despatch of letter.
37. Bank reconciliation statements.
38. Progress report of Hindi.
39. Banking arrangements of local offices.
40. Banking arrangements of Regional offices.
41. Transfer of contingency fund of Regional office.
42. Bank drafts and cheques.
43. Matters of C.L. of employees.
44. Subjects relating to General Orders of Circulars.
45. Subjects relating to accounts.
46. Subjects relating to declaration forms.
47. Miscellaneous subjects relating to Admn.
48. Subjects relating to Hindi Orders/instructions/Circulars.
49. Subjects relating to Block making.
50. Supply of duplicate Identity Cards.
51. Subjects relating to different matters.
52. Subjects relating to registration/corporation of age.
53. Subjects relating to marriage.
54. Subjects relating to internal transfers.
55. Rectification of name of the employee and his father.
56. Subjects relating to registration.
57. Subjects relating to medical reimbursement and Admn.
58. Subjects relating to circulars of medical reimbursement.
59. Subjects relating to advance payment of medical reimbursement to employees.
60. Bills returned and audit objections.
61. Correspondence with Hqrs. and other subjects.
62. Issue of Tender.
63. Printing of forms.
64. Subjects relating to monthly statement report.
65. Subjects relating to meeting of Regional Board.
66. Subjects relating to meetings of Local Committees.
67. Subjects relating to extension of scheme in different areas.
68. Comments/matters of internal audit report and other subjects.
69. Action taken on the complaints of I.I.s and disposal thereof.
70. Different subjects of employees regarding medical reimbursement Cash benefit.
71. Matters regarding statistical and other subjects.
72. Case of Accident.
73. Case of Medical Council.
74. Case of Dependent Benefit.
75. Case of Ium-sum payment.
76. Subjects relating to A.A.T.
77. Case of evaluation of PDB and D.B.
78. Subjects relating to correspondence with ESIC Union.
79. Subjects relating to complaints regarding vigilance.
80. Subjects relating to suspension etc.
81. Subjects relating to charge-sheet.
82. Subjects relating to correspondence with State Government.

नई दिल्ली, 2 अगस्त, 1984

का० प्रा० 2767.--कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 1 की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा 5 अगस्त, 1984 को उस तारीख के रूप में नियत करते हैं, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 (धारा 44 और 45 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है) और अध्याय 5 और 6 (धारा 76 की उपधारा (1) और धारा 77, 78, 79 और 81 के सिवाय जो पहले ही प्रवृत्त की जा चुकी है) के उपबन्ध मध्य प्रदेश राज्य के निम्नलिखित क्षेत्र में प्रवृत्त होंगे, अर्थात् :--

“जिला रायपुर और तहसील रायपुर में रनवाभाटा, भानपुरी तथा उरकूता के राजस्व ग्रामों के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र।”

[संख्या एस-38013/11/84-एच० आई०]

New Delhi, the 2nd August, 1984

S.O. 2767.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints the 5th August, 1984 as the date on which the provisions of Chapter IV (except sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapters V and VI (except sub-section (1) of section 76 and sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force) of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Madhya Pradesh, namely :—

“The areas comprised within the revenue, villages of Rahwabhata, Bhanpuri and, Urkuta in Tehsil Raipur and, District Raipur”.

[No. S-38013/11/84-HI]

नई दिल्ली, 6 अगस्त, 1984

का. प्रा. 2768—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स सोहम एन्टर प्राइजिज, सी-25 तथा सी-26, कृसाईगुडा इण्डस्ट्रीयल एरिया, इसिल इलेक्ट्रोनिक्स कम्पलैक्स, हैदराबाद-500762, आन्ध्र प्रदेश। नामक स्थापन के सम्बन्ध

नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस-35019(240)/84/पी. एफ.-2]

New Delhi, the 6th August, 1984

S.O. 2768.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Soham Enterprises, C-25 & 26, Kussalguda Industrial Area, Eci Electronics Complex, Hyderabad-500762, Andhra Pradesh, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(240)/84-PF. II]

का. आ. 2769 --केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स एशियाटिक डाटा कंप्यूटर सर्विसेज लिमिटेड, "क्लासिक बिल्डिंग", 24, रिचमण्ड रोड, बंगलौर-560025, कर्नाटक तथा इनकन हाउस, 31, नेताजी सुभाष रोड, कलकत्ता-1, पश्चिम बंगाल पर स्थित इसकी शाखा सहित नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस35019(239) 84/पी. एफ.-2]

S.O. 2769.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Asiatic Data Computer Services Limited, "Classic Building", 24, Richmond Road, Bangalore-560025, Karnataka including its branch at Duncun House, 31, Netaji Subhash Road, Calcutta-700001, West Bengal, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(239)/84-PF. II]

का. आ. 2770 --केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स चैतन्य इण्डस्ट्रीज, ए-7/2, इलेक्ट्रॉनिक कम्प्लेक्स, कुशाईगुडा, हैदराबाद-500762, आन्ध्र प्रदेश

नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस-35019 (238)/84-पी. एफ.-2]

S.O. 2770.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Chaitanya Industries, A-7/2, Electronic Complex, Kushaiguda; Hyderabad-500762, Andhra Pradesh, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(238)/84-PF. II]

का० आ० 2771 --केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स मैनुअल इन्टरनेशनल, 5-कामराज पार्क लेन, मद्रास-600013, तमिल नाडु तथा 38-पेदारीअर कोइल स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-600001 पर स्थित इसके प्रशासन कार्यालय सहित नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस-35019(237)/84/पी. एफ.-2]

S.O. 2771.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Manuel Internal, 5, Kamraj Park Lane, Madras-600013; Tamil Nadu including its Administration Office at 38, Pedariar Koil Street, Madras-600001, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(237)/84-PF. II]

का. आ. 2772 --केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स दि तालुक एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोड्यूस को-ओपरेटिव मार्किटिंग सोसाइटी लिमिटेड, नागामगला, कर्नाटक नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य

निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस-35019(236)/84/पी. एफ.-2]

S.O. 2772.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs The Taluk Agricultural Produce Co-operative Marketing Society Limited, Nagamangala, Karnataka, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(236)/84-PF. II]

का. आ. 2773.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स बड़जात्या फैमिली ट्रस्ट, हल्दिया हाउस, जौहरी बाजार, जयपुर, राजस्थान, नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस-35019(235)/84/पी. एफ.-2]

S.O. 2773.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Barjatya Family Trust, Haldia House, Johari Bazar, Jaipur, Rajasthan, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(235)/84-PF. II]

का. आ. 2774.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स बेदी एण्ड बेदी टी प्रोसेसिंग सिस्टम्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, 11/13, प्रथम मेन रोड, जयमङ्गल एक्स-टैन्शन, बंगलोर-560046, कर्नाटक तथा सन्दी साइड वेस्ट, मुख्य डाकघर के पास, कूनूर-643101 पर स्थित इसकी शाखा सहित, नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

638 GI/84 -13

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस-35019(234)/84/पी. एफ.-2]

S.O. 2774.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Bedi and Bedi Tea Processing Systems Private Limited, 11/13, 1st Main Road, Jayamahal Extension, Bangalore-560046, Karnataka including its branch at Sunny Side West, Near Head Post Office, Coonoor-643101, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(234)/84-PF. II]

का. आ. 2775.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स जया एन्टर प्राइजिज, प्लॉट सं. 18 तथा 19, इलैक्ट्रॉनिक्स कम्प्लेक्स, कुशाईगुडा, हैदराबाद-500762, आन्ध्र प्रदेश, नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस-35019(233)/84/पी. एफ.-2]

S.O. 2775.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Jaya Enterprises, Plot No. 18 and 19, Electronics Complex, Kusaiguda, Hyderabad-500762, Andhra Pradesh; have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(233)/84-PF. II]

का. आ. 2776.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स आशा इण्डस्ट्री (आशा पैकेजिज), सी-17, इण्डस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, मौलाग्रनी, हैदराबाद, आन्ध्र प्रदेश नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस-35019(232)/84/पी. एफ.-2]

S.O. 2776.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Asha Industry (Asha Packages), C-17, Industrial Estates, Moula Ali, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(232)/84-PF. II]

का. आ. 2777—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मंसर्स संजय खण्डसारी उद्योग, डाकघर-काडापुर, तालुक-चिकोडी, जिला-बैलगाँव, कर्नाटक, नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[मं. एस.-35019(193)/84/पी. एफ.-2]

S.O. 2777.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Sanjay Khandasari Udyog, Post Kadapur, Taluk (Chikodi), District Belgaum, Karnataka, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(193)/84-PF. II]

का. आ. 2778—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मंसर्स विजयगोविन्दा विविग कम्पनी, आजीकोडे, कन्नानोर 9, केरल, नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[मं. एम.-35019(196)/84/पी. एफ.-2]

S.O. 2778.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Vijayagovinda Weaving Company, Azhicode, Cannore-9, Kerala, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable in the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(196)/84-PF. II]

का. आ. 2779—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मंसर्स नन्दी माइनिंग एण्ड ट्रांसपोर्ट एजेंसी प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, डाकघर-जोलधर, विज, भद्रवती, शिमोगा-जिला, कर्नाटक, नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[मं. एस.-35019(197)/84/पी. एफ.-2]

S.O. 2779.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Nandi Mining and Transport Agency Private Limited, P.O. Joldhal, viz. Bhadravathi, Shimoga District, Karnataka; have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(197)/84-PF. II]

का. आ. 2780—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मंसर्स मिजोरम को-ओपरेटिव अपेक्स बैंक लिमिटेड, बड़ा बाजार, एजाल-796001, मिजोरम, नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[मं. एस.-35019(198)/84/पी. एफ.-2]

S.O. 2780.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Mizoram Co-operative Apex Bank Limited, Bara Bazar, Aizwal-796001, Mizoram, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(198)/84-PF. II]

का. आ. 2781—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मंसर्स एस. सुब्बा राव एण्ड एसोसिएट्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, सं. 241, तीसरा फेज, पीन्या इण्डस्ट्रियल एरिया, बंगलूर-560058, कर्नाटक, नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952

(1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस.-35019 (217)/84/पी. एफ.-2]

S.O. 2781.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs S. Subba Rao and Associates Private Limited, No. 241, III Phase, Peenya Industrial Area, Bangalore-560058, Karnataka; have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(217)/84-PF. II]

का. आ. 2782.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स हॉटल अजन्था, आल्ड बैंक रोड, मैसूर-1 कर्नाटक नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस.-35019 (218)/84/पी. एफ.-2]

S.O. 2782.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Hotel Ajantha, Old Bank Road, Mysore-1, Karnataka; have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(218)/84-PF. II]

का. आ. 2783.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स इन्डिया एन्टरप्राइजिज, 5वां मील, बेल्लरी रोड, बंगलूर-560024, कर्नाटक नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस.-35019 (219)/84/पी. एफ.-2]

S.O. 2783.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Inpack Enterprises, Vth Mile, Bellary Road, Bangalore-560024; Karnataka, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(219)/84-PF. II]

का. आ. 2784.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स ए पी ई (इन्डिया) प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, 18, कैम्पु-निटी सेंटर, ईस्ट आफ कौलाश, नई दिल्ली-65, और इसका कार्यालय 6, लिटिल रसल स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-71 में स्थित नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस.-35019(220)/84/पी. एफ.-2]

S.O. 2784.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs APE (India) Private Limited, 18, Community Centre, East of Kailash, New Delhi-65 and its office at 6, Little Russell Street, Calcutta-700071, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(220)/84-PF. II]

का. आ. 2785.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स मोक्ष एन्टरप्राइजिज एफ-5/6, नाचराम इण्डस्ट्रीयल एस्टेट, नाचराम, हैदराबाद-500039, आन्ध्र प्रदेश नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस.-35019 (221)/84/पी. एफ.-2]

S.O. 2785.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Moksha Enterprises, F. 5/6, Nacharam Industrial Estate, Nacharam, Hyderabad-500039, Andhra Pradesh have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(221)/84-PF. II]

का० आ० 2786:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स बालाजी फाउन्ड्री, श्री शानमुगा इण्डस्ट्रियल एस्टेट, 1/536, मेल्लुपालायम रोड, कोयम्बटूर-641030, तमिल नाडू नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस०-35019 (192)/84/पी० एफ०-2]

S.O. 2786.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Balaji Foundry, Sri Shanmuga Industrial Estate, 1/536, Mettupalayam Road, Coimbatore-641030, Tamil Nadu, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(192)/84-PF. II]

का० आ० 2787:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स इकोनॉमिक पैकेजिंग कॉर्पोरेशन, 2बी-1, इण्डस्ट्रियल एरिया, ए० बी० रोड, देवास-455001 (एम. पी.) और कार्यालय ईलव चैम्बरस, ग्रीन स्ट्रीट, फोर्ट, बम्बई नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस०-35019(263)/84/पी० एफ०-2]

S.O. 2787.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Economic Packaging Corporation, 2B-1, Industrial Area, AB Road, Dewas (MP) including its office at FLVE Chambers, Green Street, Fort, Bombay; have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(263)/84-PF. II]

का० आ० 2788:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स विजय स्टील प्रोडक्ट्स, डबल्यू जेड-75/33, शकुरपुर, दिल्ली-34 नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस०-35019 (261)/84/पी० एफ०-2]

S.O. 2788.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Vijay Steel Products, WZ-75/33, Shakurpur, Delhi-110034; have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(261)/84 P.F. II]

का० आ० 2789:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स दी जवाला कोऑपरेटिव अर्बन थ्रिफ्ट एण्ड क्रेडिट सोसायटी लिमिटेड, फ्लैट नं. 218/261, सईकल मार्केट, झण्डेवलान, फेज-1, नई दिल्ली-110055 नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस०-35019(255)/84/पी० एफ०-2]

S.O. 2789.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs The Jawala Co-operative Urban Thrift and Credit Society Limited, Flat No. 218/261, Cycle Market, Jhandewalan; Phase-I, New Delhi-110055, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-3519(255)/84-PF. II]

का० आ० 2790:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स ए० पी० बालूहा टी एण्ड इन्टर-प्रईजिज, प्र० लिमिटेड, 108 न्यू पार्क स्ट्रीट बल्लभनगर-17 अपने इन्दु भवन, महानगर गांधी रोड, जॉरहट-785001

SO 2794—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as messrs G M Bosu 7 Lyons Range Calcutta 700001 including its office at P-79 Lake Road Calcutta-700029 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment.

Now, therefore in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment

[No S 35017(44)/84-PF II]

का०आ० 2795—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स जय जय रबरस 49/3 मथेश्वर ताला रोड, कलकत्ता-46 अपने 28-ए, रोलैंड रोड, कलकत्ता-700020 स्थित प्रधान कार्यालय सहित नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबध्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबध्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किये जाने चाहिए

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबध्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[स०एस-35017(45)/84/पी० एफ०-2]

SO 2795—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as messrs Jay Jay Rubbers, 49 A/3, Matheswartola Road, Calcutta-46 including its Head Office at 28 A, Rowland Road, Calcutta-700020, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment

[No S 35017(45)/84-PF II]

का०आ० 2796—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि, मैसर्स एस० आर० वाटलीबोर्ड कन्सलटेन्ट्स(प्रा०) लिमिटेड, 36 गणेश चन्द्र एवेन्यू, कलकत्ता-13 अपने रजि० आफिस, 17, डा० सुन्दरी मोहन एवेन्यू, कलकत्ता-14, ओर शाखाओं (1) रोजन्ट चैम्बर, नारीमन प्वाइंट, बम्बई-21, (2) हिमालय हाऊस 23, करतूरवा गॉंधी मार्ग नई दिल्ली-1 पर स्थित नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबध्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबध्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबध्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[स० एस-35017(49)/84/पी० एफ०-2]

SO 2796—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs

S R Bhat Consultants Private Limited 36 Ganesh Chandra Avenue Calcutta 13 including its Registered Office at 17 D J Sundari Mohan Avenue Calcutta 14 and Branch Offices at (i) Regent Chamber Nairman Point, Bombay 21 (ii) Himalaya House 23, Kasturba Gandhi Marg New Delhi have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment

Now, the effect in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment

[No S-35017(42)/84 PF II]

का०आ० 2797—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स पालयपापालायाम ए०एस०सी०एम्० लिमिटेड, पालायाम 609130, सिरकाली लालक, जिला तन्जौर, तमिल नाडू। नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबध्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबध्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किये जाने चाहिये।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबध्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[स० एस-35019(260)/84/पी० एफ०-2]

SO 2797—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as messrs Palayapalayam A S C S Limited Palayapalayam 609130, Sirkali Taluk Anjore District, Tamil Nadu have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment.

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment

[No S 35019(260)/84/PF II]

का०आ० 2798—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स सनजल इंजीनियरिंग प्राईवेट लिमिटेड 1217, 23वाँ मेन, 23वाँ, क्रास बानाशकरी, दूसरा चरण, बंगलोर-70, कर्नाटक तथा बी-1 सिडको, होसूर तमिल नाडू स्थित इसकी फैक्टरी सहित नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबध्ध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबध्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किये जाने चाहिए

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबध्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है

[स० एस-35019(259)/84/पी० एफ०-2]

SO 2798—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as messrs Sunjal Engineering Private Limited 1217, 23rd Main, 23rd Cross, Banashankari, II Stage Bangalore-560070 Karnaṇṇa including its factory at B-1, SIDCO, Hosur, Tamil Nadu have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident

Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(259)/84/PF. II]

का०आ० 2799 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स काल्डायने कन्सल्टेंट्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, जेड-26, प्रथम मंजिल, होज खास, नई दिल्ली-110016, नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किये जाने चाहिये ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[स० एस-35019(258)/84/पी० एफ०-2]

S.O. 2799.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as m/s Caldye Consultants Private Limited, Z-26, 1st Floor, Hauz Khas, New Delhi-110016, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(258)/84-PF. II]

का०आ० 2800 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स रहमानिया मशीनरीज फैक्टरी, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, आजमाबाद, हैदराबाद-20, आन्ध्र प्रदेश। नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किये जाने चाहिये।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[स० एस-35019(222)/84/पी० एफ०-2]

S.O. 2800.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as messrs Rahmania Machines Factory, Industrial Area, Azamabad, Hyderabad-20, Andhra Pradesh, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(222)/84-PF. II]

का०आ० 2801 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स इंडस्ट्रियल एड फार्म इक्विपमेंट, दिसपुर, गंगाटो-781015, आसाम तथा नेताजी सुभाष एवेन्यू, सिलचर-78805 - आसाम और मन्त्री पुखुरी, इम्फाल मनीपुर स्थित इसकी शाखाओं सहित नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किये जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[स० एस-35019(223)/84/पी० एफ०-2]

S.O. 2801.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as messrs Industrial & Farm Equipment, Dispur, Gauhati-781005, Assam including its branches at (i) Netaji Subhash Avenue, Silchar-78805, Assam and (ii) Mantripukhuri, Imphal, Manipur have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(223)/84-PF. II]

का०आ० 2802 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स सुमन इलेक्ट्रॉनिक्स, 17 ए, कुशाईगुडा इलेक्ट्रॉनिक्स कम्प्लेक्स, हैदराबाद-500762, आन्ध्र प्रदेश नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किये जाने चाहिए ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[स० एस-35019(224)/84/पी० एफ०-2]

S.O. 2802.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as messrs Suman Electronics, 17-A, Kushaiguda Electronics Complex, Hyderabad-500762, Andhra Pradesh, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(224)/84-PF. II]

का०आ० 2803 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स न्यू थियेटर, थोडूप्पा, केरल नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर

सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस-35019(225)/84/पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 2803.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as messrs New Theatre, Thedupurha, Kozala have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment;

[No. S-35019(225)/84-PF. II]

का० आ० 2804.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स मोहन वुड वर्क्स, आई०डी०ए० चेरल पल्ली, हैदराबाद-500051, आंध्र प्रदेश नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस-35019(227)/84/पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 2804.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as messrs Mohan's Wood Works, I.D.A. Cherlapalli, Hyderabad-500051, Andhra Pradesh, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment;

[No. S-35019(227)/84-PF. II]

का० आ० 2805.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स कल्याणी मैच फैक्ट्री, 2-154, इयानार कालोनी सीथुराजपुरा, (वय) तिरुवन्कोट, तमिल नाडु नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा की

उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस-35019(228)/84/पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 2805.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as messrs Ruckmani Match Factory, 2-154, Iyyanar Colony, Sithurajapuram, (Via) Sivakasi, Tamil Nadu, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment;

[No. S-35019(228)/84-P.F.]

का० आ० 2806.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स इलेक्ट्रो मैग्नेटिक डेविसिस, बी-1, इलेक्ट्रॉनिक कम्प्लेक्स, कुशागुडा, हैदराबाद-500762, आंध्र प्रदेश नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस-35019(229)/84/पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 2806.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as messrs Electro Magnetic Devices, B-1, Electronic Complex, Kushaiguda, Hyderabad-500762, Andhra Pradesh, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment;

[No. S-35019(229)/84-P.F. II]

का० आ० 2807.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स पुल्टैक्स (इण्डिया), कल्याणी गार्डन्स, एन०आर० कालोनी, बंगलूर-560050, कर्नाटक नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं. एस-35019(230)/84-पी०एफ०-2]

S.O. 2807.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as messrs Pultux (India) Kalyani Gardens, N. R. Colony, Bangalore-

560050, Karnataka, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment;

[No. S-35019(230)/84-PF. II]

का०आ० 2808—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स राजधानी सेल्स कारपोरेशन, 12/1, मथुरा रोड, डाकघर अमर नगर, फरीदाबाद-121003, हरियाणा तथा 27-ए, न्यू मण्डी, मुजफ्फरनगर, उत्तर प्रदेश स्थित इसके पंजीकृत कार्यालय सहित नामक स्थापन से सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहु संख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एम-35019 (231)/84/पीएफ-2]

S.O. 2808.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as messs Rajdhani Sales Corporation, 12/1, Mathura Road, P. O. Amar, Nagar Faridabad-121003, Haryana including its Registered Office at 27-A, New Mandi, Muzaffar Nagar, Uttar Pradesh, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment;

[No. S-35019(231)/84-PF. II]

का०आ० 2809.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स महेश आटो, 5-14-42, अवालत रोड, औरंगाबाद 43101 (महाराष्ट्र) नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35018(20)/84/पी एफ 2]

S.O. 2809.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Mahesh Auto, 5-14-42, Adalat Road, Aurangabad-431001 (Maharashtra) have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident

Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35018(20)/84-PF. II]

का०आ०.—2810 केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मेसर्स सरियाज डाई टैक्स्ट केमिकल्स प्रा० लि०, डब्ल्यू 9, एम आई डी सी फेज-2, सोनारपाड़ा, डोमबिवली (ईस्ट) डिस्ट, थाने और रजि० कार्यालय 404, बीना चैम्बर्स एल एल शाह मार्ग (क्लाई रोड), दादा बन्दर, बम्बई-9 नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एम-35018(15)/84/पी एफ-2]

ए० के० मट्टारई, अवसर सचिव

S.O. 2810.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Shreyas Dyetex Chemicals Private Limited, W-9, MIDC, Phase-II, Sonarpada Dombivli (East) District Thane including its Registered Office at 404, Vecna Chambers, 1. L. Shah Marg (Clive Road), Dana Bunder, Bombay-400009 have agreed that the provisions of the Employees Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35018(15)/84/PF. II]

A. K. BHATTARAI, Under Secy.

अस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 3 अगस्त, 1984

का० आ० 2811.—सरकारी स्थान (प्राधिकृत अधि-भोगियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के अस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 2882 तारीख 17 अक्तूबर, 1981 का अविक्रमण करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार अस कल्याण संगठन, करमा, बिहार के लेखा-धिकारी को, जो सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी है, उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनार्थ सम्बद्ध अधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त करती है और यह भी निर्देश देती है कि उक्त अधिकारी तालिका के कालम 2 में निर्दिष्ट सरकारी परिसरों के संबंध में अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अन्दर उक्त अधिनियम के द्वारा संघदा अधिहारी को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेगा और उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन सारे गए कार्य को करेगा।

तानिका

अधिकारी का पदनाम सरकारी परिसर के वर्ग और क्षेत्राधिकार की स्थानीय सीमाएं

1	2
लेखाधिकारी, श्रम कल्याण अभ्रक खान श्रम कल्याण संगठन के संगठन करमा, बिहार।	प्रशासनिक नियंत्रणाधीन परिसर, जा बिहार राज्य में हजारीबाग, गया, गिरिडीह और मुंगेर जिलों में स्थित हैं।

[सं० जेड-20025/8/81 एम० 3/डब्ल्यू०-1]

कवर राजिन्द्र सिंह, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 3rd August, 1984

S.O. 2811.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the public premises (Eviction of unauthorised occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971) and in supersession of the notification of Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 2882 dated the 17th October, 1981 the Central Government hereby appoints the Accounts Officer, Labour Welfare Organisation, Karma, Bihar, being a Gazetted Officer of Government to be estate officer for the purpose of the said Act, and further directs that the said officer shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed on estate officer by or under the said Act, within the limits of his respective jurisdiction in respect of the public premises specified in column 2 of the Table :

THE TABLE

Designation of the Officer	Categories of public premises and local limits of jurisdiction
(1)	(2)
Accounts Officer, Labour Welfare Organisation Karma, Bihar	Premises under the administrative control of the Mines Labour Welfare Organisation situated in the Districts of Hazaribagh, Gaya, Giridih, and Monghyr in the State of Bihar.

[File No. Z-20025/08/1981-M-III/WI]
KANWAR RAJINDER SINGH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 4 अगस्त, 1984

का० आ० 2812—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि लोकहित में ऐसा करना अपेक्षित था, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खंड (ड) के उपखंड (vi) के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 661 दिनांक 16 फरवरी, 1984 द्वारा फासफोराइट खनन उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 23 फरवरी, 1984 से छः मास की कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित किया था।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोकहित में उक्त काला-

वधि को छः मास की और कालावधि के लिए बढ़ाया जाना अपेक्षित है।

अतः अग, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खंड (ड) के उपखंड (vi) के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 23 अगस्त, 1984 से छः मास की और कालावधि के लिए लोक सेवा उपयोगी घोषित करती है।

[फा० संख्या एम-11017/2/80-डी-1 (ए)]

New Delhi, the 4th August, 1984

S.O. 2812.—Whereas the Central Government having been satisfied that the public interest so required had, in pursuance of the provision of sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), declared by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour S.O. No. 661 dated the 18th February, 1984 the Phosphate Mining Industry to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act, for a period of six months, from the 23rd February, 1984.

And whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that public interest requires the extension of the said period by a further period of six months;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-clause (vi) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby declares the said industry to be a public utility service for the purpose of the said Act, for a further period of six months from the 23rd August, 1984.

[No. S-11017/2/80-D.I(A)]

का० आ० 2813.—केन्द्रीय सरकार के यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि लोकहित में ऐसा करना अपेक्षित था औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खंड (ड) के उपखंड (vi) के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 663 दिनांक 18 फरवरी 1984 द्वारा फासफोराइट खनन उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 23 फरवरी, 1984 से छः मास की कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित किया था।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोकहित में उक्त कालावधि को छः मास की और कालावधि के लिए बढ़ाया जाना अपेक्षित है।

अतः अग, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खंड (ड) के उपखंड (vi) के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 23 अगस्त, 1984 से छः मास की और कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित करती है।

[संख्या एम-11017/1/83-डी-1 (ए)]

एम० एच० एस० अर्यर, अवसर सचिव

S.O. 2813.—Whereas the Central Government having been satisfied that the public interest so required had, in pursuance of the provision of sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), declared by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation S.O. No. 663

dated the 18th February, 1984 the Prites Mining industry to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act, for a period of six months, from the 23rd February, 1984;

And whereas the Central Government is of opinion that public interest requires the extension of the said period by a further period of six months,

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby declares the said industry to be a public utility service for the purpose of the said Act, for a further period of six months from the 23rd August, 1984.

[No. S-11017/1/80-D.I(A)]

S. H. S. IYER, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 अगस्त, 1984

का० आ० 2814—केन्द्रीय सरकार, उत्प्रवास अधिनियम, 1983 (1983 का 31) की धारा 5 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए श्रम विभाग में अनुभाग अधिकारी श्री एम० एम० टांगरी को 4 अगस्त, 1984 के पूर्वाह्न से अगले आदेश जारी होने तक उत्प्रवास संरक्षी, दिल्ली के रूप में सभी संगत दस्तावजों पर हस्ताक्षर करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[संख्या ए-22012/3/84-इमिग्रेशन- III]

New Delhi the 8th August 1984

S.O. 2814.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5 of the Emigration Act, 1983 (31 of 1983), the Central Government hereby authorises Shri M. S. Tangry, Section Officer, Department of Labour, to sign all relevant documents as Protector of Emigrants, Delhi, with effect from the forenoon of 4th August, 1984 till further orders.

[No. A-22012/3/84-FMIG. II]

का. आ० 2815 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार, उत्प्रवास अधिनियम 1983 (1983 का 31) की धारा 3 की उप धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए श्री एम. एम. टांगरी, उत्प्रवास संरक्षी, दिल्ली के स्थान पर 4 अगस्त, 1984 के पूर्वाह्न से श्री शिवकुमार, भा. पु से (यू.टी. एस. पी. एस.) को उत्प्रवास संरक्षी, दिल्ली नियुक्त करती हैं।

[संख्या ए-22012/3/84-इमिग्रेशन-II]

आर. नागयणास्वामी, उप सचिव

S.O. 2815.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Emigration Act, 1983 (31 of 1983), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Shiv Kumar, IPS (UT : SPS) to be the Protector of Emigrants, Delhi with effect from the forenoon of 4th August, 1984, vice Shri M. S. Tangry, Protector of Emigrants, Delhi.

[No. A-22012/3/84-EMIG. II]
R. NARAYANASWAMI, Dy. Secy.

